Studies in Educational Leadership 12

Rose M. Ylimaki
Stephen L. Jacobson *Editors*

US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation

Implications for Successful Instructional Leadership, Organizational Learning, and Culturally Responsive Practices

Springer

US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation

STUDIES IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

VOLUME 12

SCOPE OF THE SERIES

Leadership we know makes all the difference in success or failures of organizations. This series will bring together in a highly readable way the most recent insights in successful leadership. Emphasis will be placed on research focused on pre-collegiate educational organizations. Volumes should address issues related to leadership at all levels of the educational system and be written in a style accessible to scholars, educational practitioners and policy makers throughout the world.

The volumes – monographs and edited volumes – should represent work from different parts in the world.

For further volumes:
http://www.springer.com/series/6543

US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation

Implications for Successful Instructional Leadership, Organizational Learning, and Culturally Responsive Practices

Editors

Rose M. Ylimaki

University of Arizona, USA

Stephen L. Jacobson

University at Buffalo, USA

Springer

Editors
Prof. Rose M. Ylimaki
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona
USA
rylimaki@email.arizona.edu

Prof. Stephen L. Jacobson
University at Buffalo
State University of New York
Buffalo, New York
USA
eoakiml@buffalo.edu

ISBN 978-94-007-0541-8 e-ISBN 978-94-007-0542-5
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5
Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York

Library of Congress Control Number: 2011921315

Rose M. Ylimaki dedicates this book to Leslie McClain and Sue Mattson, my lifelong travel companions and sisters of the heart.

Stephen L. Jacobson wishes to dedicate this work to 'Grandpa' Joe Greber, whose terminal illness and passing during the latter stages of this project reminded the entire Greber–Jacobson family about what is really important during this short time we share together.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank a number of individuals who have contributed in many ways to the production of this book. Although the principals and other participants in our International Study of Successful School Principals (ISSPP) must remain anonymous, we gratefully acknowledge their time and insights about what it means to be a successful school leader of organizational learning, instructional leadership, and culturally responsive practices in their particular contexts. Chris Day and Ken Leithwood invited us to participate in the International Study of Successful School Leadership. Their mentoring and support are reflected in the conceptualization and organization of this volume. We also want to thank all the members of the growing body of ISSPP research teams for their collegial support and enthusiasm for sustaining this project. We are also grateful to our frequent conference paper discussants and symposium, Gary Crow, Karen Seashore, and Phil Hallinger, for their discerning and constructive comments about the International Study of Successful School Leadership (ISSPP). Past members of the University at Buffalo research team, Lauri Johnson, Corrie Giles, and Sharon Brooks all provided many valuable insights to the development of the US case studies. Yoka Janssen at Springer–Kluwer gave us support and skillful editorial supervision. Our colleagues and graduate students at the University at Buffalo and the University of Arizona provided us with support and constructive feedback on many of the ideas about leadership practice and preparation included in this volume.

Contents

Contributors

Christopher Day School of Education, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK
e-mail: christopher.day@nottingham.ac.uk

Lawrie Drysdale University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
e-mail: drysdale@unimelb.edu.au

David Gurr University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
e-mail: dgurr@unimelb.edu.au

Stephen L. Jacobson University at Buffalo, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY, USA
e-mail: eoakiml@buffalo.edu

Olof Johansson Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
e-mail: olof.johansson@pol.umu.se

Lauri Johnson Boston College, Chestnut Hill, USA
e-mail: lauri.johnson@bc.edu

Kasper Kofod Danish School of Education, University of Aarhus, Aarhus, Denmark
e-mail: kako@dpu.dk

Kenneth Leithwood Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON M5S 1V5, Canada
e-mail: kenneth.leithwood@utoronto.ca

Jorunn Møller University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
e-mail: jorunn.moller@ils.uio.no

Lejf Moos Danish School of Education, University of Aarhus, Aarhus, Denmark
e-mail: moos@dpu.dk

Eli Ottesen Department of Teacher Education and School Research, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
e-mail: eli.ottesen@ils.uio.no

Petros Pashiardis Open University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus
e-mail: ppashardis@ouc.ac.cy

Vassos Savvides Open University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus
e-mail: savvides@ouc.ac.cy

Gunn Vedøy University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
e-mail: gunn.vedoy@ils.uio.no

Rose M. Ylimaki University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA
e-mail: rylimaki@email.arizona.edu

Chapter 1
Comparative Perspectives: An Overview of Seven Educational Contexts

Stephen L. Jacobson and Rose M. Ylimaki

1.1 Introduction and Overview

There is growing evidence that principals can play a significant role in developing, influencing, and sustaining school improvement initiatives, particularly as they pertain to increasing student academic and affective performance. To be successful in the sustained undertaking of such initiatives, principals must motivate and encourage teachers, students, parents, and other community members to join their collective efforts to create positive, engaging school climates that will increase the likelihood of improved student performance (Leithwood and Riehl 2005). While research findings indicate a positive relationship between leadership and school success, questions remain as to the underlying causes of such associations and the extent to which the strength of these relationships can be generalized from one national context to another. We believe that the pursuit of such findings would help establish cross-national profiles of successful school leaders and thus contribute to our understanding of specific principal practices that are responsive to and address the needs of schools in a range of diverse contexts.

In the first section of this book, we report case study findings from schools in Australia, Cyprus, Denmark, England, Norway, Sweden, and the United States around three key issues: (1) leadership for organizational learning and capacity building, (2) instructional leadership, and (3) culturally responsive leadership practices. For each of these broad themes, we looked for similarities and differences in the practices of successful principals in the United States in comparison to those of successful principals in two other countries. Specifically, we compared the cases of successful principals in the United States with those of successful principals from England and Sweden relative to leadership for organizational learning and capacity building; with those of successful principals from Australia and Denmark relative to instructional leadership; and finally with those of successful principals from Cyprus and Norway relative to culturally responsive leadership practices. Regardless

S. L. Jacobson (✉)
University at Buffalo, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY, USA
e-mail: eoakiml@buffalo.edu

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5_1, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

of national context, we asked the same overarching question in every case study, "What are the characteristics and practices of a principal or head teacher in a successful school?" Then, looking across the three national contexts for each of the three key issues, we asked, "Which principal characteristics and practices are similar, which are different, and, what are the underlying reasons for these similarities and differences?"

In the second section of the book, we asked the same authors, from each triad, to describe educational leadership preparation in each country, consider the implications of their findings for improving the preparation of school leaders in their respective countries, and provide exemplars from leadership preparation programs and the principals'/head teachers' experiences. We think the practical applications of these findings for leadership preparation could potentially go a long way toward improving the life chances of children, not only in the seven nations studied, but around the world as well.

The case studies used in chapters three through five of section one were drawn from and represent a secondary analysis of data collected from seven of what is now 15 nations that comprise the International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP).[1] To better understand the larger study from which these cases were drawn, this chapter first offers the reader a history and overview of the ISSPP, including a discussion of its guiding theoretical framework, a description of the research methodologies employed, and the study's limitations.[2] We then explain why leadership for organizational learning and capacity building, instructional leadership, and culturally responsive leadership practices were selected for further analysis. Finally, we describe several key factors that are critical for understanding the case studies from Australia, Cyprus, Denmark, England, Norway, Sweden, and the United States, with specific attention paid to the effects of increased public accountability, tensions in centralization/decentralization governance and changes in demographic diversity.

1.2 A Brief History of the International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP)

The project began in 2001 with a meeting called by Professor Christopher Day at the University of Nottingham and was originally called the International Successful School Leadership Project (more about the name change later in this chapter). Representatives from Australia (examining schools in Victoria and Tasmania), Canada, China (examining schools in Shanghai), Denmark, England, Norway, Sweden, and the United States (examining schools in Western New York) agreed to create a da-

[1] To address culturally responsive practices, two schools with more diverse student bodies were added to the study in Norway.

[2] For more details about the ISSPP see Journal of Educational Administration, 2005, 43(6) and Leithwood and Day (2007).

tabase of case study examinations of successful school principals in their respective countries. The origin and methodology of the ISSPP lay in an earlier study of English schools conducted by Day et al. (2000) that included: (1) data collected from multiple constituent perspectives, specifically head teachers, deputy heads, governors, parents, students, support staff, and teachers; (2) comparisons of effective leadership in diverse contexts ranging from small primary schools to large urban secondary schools; and (3) the identification of personal qualities and professional competencies generic to these effective school leaders.

1.2.1 The Theoretical Framework of the ISSPP

In the development of its guiding conceptual framework, project researchers drew initially from models of leadership articulated in four major research projects—leading schools in times of change (Day et al. 2000), successful school leadership (Gurr et al. 2003), leadership for school–community partnerships (Kilpatrick et al. 2002), and leadership for organizational learning and improved student outcomes (Mulford et al. 2004). The resulting framework was further informed by a comprehensive review of the literature on successful school leadership prepared by Leithwood and Riehl (2005) for the American Educational Research Association's (AERA) Division A Task Force on Developing Research in Educational Leadership, which identified a set of core leadership practices that are necessary, but insufficient, for school success regardless of the school's context. Specifically, these core leadership practices for success are: (1) setting directions by identifying and articulating a vision, fostering the acceptance of group goals and creating high performance expectations; (2) developing people by offering intellectual stimulation, providing individualized support and an appropriate role model; and, (3) redesigning the organization by strengthening school cultures, modifying organizational structures, and building collaborative processes (Leithwood and Riehl 2005).

A careful review of the literature on school leadership revealed that much of the prior research in this field tended to focus on effective schools, not on successful principals. When a successful leader had been the research focus, the findings tended to be based upon the individual's self-report, narrative single lens accounts, input–output measures or examples from the world of business. Therefore, borrowing from the approach employed by Day et al. (2000), it was decided that for the ISSPP, a sharper focused lens was required built on the following assumptions: (1) multi-perspective data, collected from multiple school constituents would yield richer, more authentic data about successful principals than was hitherto available; (2) such data are best provided by those with the closest working knowledge of the principal and his or her daily practices, therefore interview pools would include teachers, support staff, students, parents, and other community members; and (3) collaborative research designed to a set of mutually agreed upon protocols, then applied across diverse national contexts would provide a better understandings of and insights into the similarities of what successful principals do to improve schools

regardless of context—as well as the differences that exist in their practices that result because of differences in context.

In a nutshell, the ISSPP sought answers to the following key questions:

1. What practices do successful principals use?
2. Do these practices vary across contexts?
3. What gives rise to successful principal leadership?
4. Under what conditions are the effects of such practices heightened or diminished?
5. Which variables effectively "link" principals' influence to student learning? (Leithwood 2005, p. 620).

1.2.2 Research Methods Employed and Limitations of the Study

For the ISSPP, a multi-case study methodology was utilized that employed purposive sampling in order to select school study sites in each country. Study sites were selected using, whenever possible, documented evidence of student achievement that exceeded expectations on standardized tests, testimonials to principals' exemplary reputations, and other indicators of school-specific success. In other words, the "successful" principals that were studied were selected based on a range of evidence indicating that their schools had improved under their leadership. Thus, the ISSPP rests upon an a priori and mainly circumstantial argument that if a school's improvement (however measured) had occurred during a principal's term, then s/he probably had a hand in making it possible. The primary objectives of the larger study were to determine, in each case, whether key participants—teachers, support staff, parents, students, and the principals themselves—believed that the principal had actually played a key role in the school's success and, if so, specifically what was it about the principal's traits, attitudes, beliefs, and/or behaviors that made it happen. So, for example, in New York State, where the U.S. sampling was done, seven schools from the western region of the state were selected, each school having shown evidence of improved student academic performance on standardized tests during the tenure of the principal studied. The U.S. team added one additional requirement for the selection of a case site—that the school had to be listed as being in "high need" by New York State's Education Department, a categorization based upon the percentage of the student body eligible for free or reduced lunch. Therefore, the sites examined by the U.S. team were exclusively "challenging" contexts. While this was not a selection criterion for the other national teams, similar type of "challenging" schools were also found in England and Australia, and to a much lesser extent in Norway, Denmark, Sweden, and Shanghai.

Once a site was identified, primary data were then gathered from interviews with the school's principal, 20% of the school's teachers, 20% of its support staff, and focus groups of parents and students. A common, semi-structured interview protocol was developed specifically for the ISSPP and used in every case study. Essentially, the interview protocols were derived from the four research projects described in the theoretical framework, focusing particularly on the core leadership practices

identified by Leithwood and Riehl (2005). For the purpose of triangulation, secondary data were also obtained from official school documents, minutes of meetings, press reports, historical sources and ethnographic notes taken during visits by the research teams. Interviews were fully or partially transcribed, coded, and then analyzed specifically in relation to the key questions noted above and more generally in terms of the theoretical framework.

Over the first 8 years of the study, more than 65 cases were developed across these different national contexts, making it one of the largest international studies of successful school leadership ever undertaken. Yet, typical of qualitative research, findings from these cases are primarily descriptive and informative, therefore, transference to other contexts must be undertaken with caution. Nevertheless, we believe that the scope and quantitative breadth of the ISSPP go some way in overcoming weaknesses typical of qualitative research (Leithwood 2005).

1.3 Key Leadership Issues: Leadership for Organizational Learning and Capacity Building, Instructional Leadership, and Culturally Responsive Leadership Practices

This book expands upon a set of papers originally presented at the 2006 annual meeting of the AERA in San Francisco, and then subsequently reorganized and further developed for a special theme issue of International Studies in Educational Administration (ISEA) volume 35 no. 3 (Ylimaki and Jacobson 2007). The U.S. research team, from the University at Buffalo (UB), conceived of the idea for the AERA session after considerable discussion about their initial analysis of the seven cases they had prepared for the ISSPP. The team members (Stephen Jacobson, Rose Ylimaki, Lauri Johnson, and Corrie Giles) agreed that while they had described the core practices of the successful principals they had studied, they had not given sufficient attention to: (1) the extent to which schools had emerged as learning organizations; (2) the role of instructional leadership in enabling school success; and, (3) the role of culturally responsive leadership in improving school–community relationships.

The UB team therefore decided to re-examine its original data relative to each of these three issues. So, for example, Giles (2007) explored the strategies used by principals to improve student achievement whilst having to confront highly unionized workforces steeped in traditional pedagogy. He found that school success depended upon a principal's transformational and transformative organizational capacity-building practices in transitioning their school into professional learning community.

Similarly, drawing from a theoretical framework composed of instructional leadership (e.g., Hallinger 2004; Marks and Printy 2003), curriculum decision-making as political acts (Apple 1992), and successful school leadership (e.g., Leithwood and Riehl 2005), Ylimaki (2007) found that despite considerable challenges, the successful principals in the U.S. cases functioned as instructional leaders by lever-

aging accountability pressures and, in one instance, taking on direct instructional role at times by teaching in particularly challenging classrooms, thus offering teachers and community members hope, collective power, and support to improve achievement for all children.

Finally, Johnson (2007) noted that despite increasing attention paid to "culturally responsive pedagogy" (e.g., Ladson-Billings 1995a, b; Villegas and Lucas 2002), far less as been afforded "culturally responsive leadership." Reanalyzing the U.S. cases, she explained how principals' life experiences, educational philosophies, and dispositions informed their approach to culturally responsive leadership, thus enabling them to juggle competing demands and build empowering relationships with teachers, parents, and community members in linguistically, culturally, religiously, ethnically, and racially diverse schools.

The insights gained from re-examining the original seven U.S. case studies begged the question of whether these three categories of leadership practices vary across national contexts and, if so, how? Subsequently, in a special 2007 issue of ISEA devoted to the International Study of Successful School Principals, we tested these ideas by conducting three sets of paired cross-national analyses, matching the U.S. findings in each case (Giles 2007; Ylimaki 2007; Johnson 2007) with those of England (Day 2007), Australia (Gurr 2007) and Norway (Vedoy and Moller 2007) around organizational capacity building, instructional leadership, and culturally responsive leadership, respectively. In the issue's concluding article, Crow (2007) described the "dimensions of complexity in leadership practices" that emerged from these sets of analyses, noting that while key similarities, which align with Leithwood's and Riehl's (2005) notion of core leadership practices for success exist across the contexts, differences in practices could be found not only across international boundaries, but intra-nationally as well. For example, in the three urban school cases from the United States, two (Fraser and Hamilton) had extremely homogeneous populations—each having over 95% African American youngsters. In contrast, the third school, Costello, had a far more diverse student body, with 56% African American, 30% Caucasian, 9% Native American, and 5% Hispanic (Jacobson et al. 2005). Moreover, Costello was far and away the largest of the three schools in terms of enrollment, with over 800 students, as compared to roughly 500 in Fraser and only 350 in Hamilton.

Both of these contextual factors can slow or impede a principal's ability to redesign the organization and/or communicate with her school community. With a faculty of 56 teachers, the Costello principal had to supervise and coordinate the activities of a workforce 30% larger than at Fraser (43 teachers) and 55% larger than at Hamilton (33%). This broader span of control increases complexity in scheduling and communication so that trying to modify a master schedule in order to create time for common planning, committee work, and smaller student groupings is far more complicated for a larger faculty. All other things being equal, having a larger faculty also reduces the opportunity for the number of individual contacts a principal can have with her staff. Similarly, engaging a considerably larger parent community reduces the opportunity for the principal to hold as many one-on-one meetings with parents, and, given the greater racial and ethnic diversity of the Costello

community, increases the potential for miscommunications due to differences in cultural cues.

Our first attempt at cross-national comparisons in ISEA led us to wonder how much more information could be gleaned if we added a third nation to each analysis. In addition, we thought that it would be challenging to have the teams from all three countries co-author each of the comparative chapters, rather than writing separate pieces as was done in the issue of ISEA. We also thought it would be informative to ask our national triads to then consider their collective findings in terms of the potential implications for the preparation of future school leaders across these diverse contexts. Consequently, in this book the chapter about leadership for organizational learning includes the United States, England, and Sweden; the chapter examining instructional leadership now includes cases and authors from the United States, Australia, and Denmark; and finally, the chapter on culturally responsive leadership includes the United States, Norway, and Cyprus. Then, in the second half of the text, the same combination of authors write about leadership preparation from the perspective of each of our three leadership concerns.

1.4 Key Contextual Factors Across the Seven Nations

In order to lay the groundwork for these comparative chapters and provide the reader some background, we asked each of the seven contributing national teams to draft a brief overview of the educational governance and policy context in their respective countries. We asked the authors to address at least three aspects of the educational contexts in these nations: public accountability, centralization/decentralization of governance, and demographic diversity. Theoretically, the schools studied in these seven nations can be positioned at various points on continua for each of the three factors. So, for example, while racial/ethnic diversity is quite common in the United States, it is far less so in Cyprus and Norway. Similarly, while English and American principals have had to deal with public scrutiny and league table style accountability for at least a decade, it has only come more recently to principals in Denmark.

Since we use the U.S. case studies as a common element in each of national triads, we begin our overview there, followed alphabetically by information about the other six nations (Australia, Cyprus, Denmark, England, Norway, and Sweden):

1.4.1 The United States of America

In the United States, the federal government is not primarily responsible for public education; instead each state maintains an autonomous educational system, and most decentralize educational governance still further by delegating considerable authority to local school districts (Jacobson 2007). These local educational agen-

cies range in number from almost 1,100 in Texas to 1 in Hawaii, and, based on 2000 census data, serve over 47 million students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12 collectively. Distribution of educational revenue in America is also highly decentralized, with only 7% of a school's funding coming from the federal government on average, and the remainder split almost equally between state and local sources. But while federal involvement represents a relatively small share of governance and funding, it wields a greater influence over educational policy, increasing most notably since the enactment of "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB) legislation in 2002.

In terms of accountability, schools now operate under greater public scrutiny because NCLB requires annual testing in reading and math for all students, and test results are made public. Schools not making adequate progress toward meeting annual achievement goals are subject to corrective actions and increasingly severe consequences, which also take place under the bright light of media scrutiny. In New York (where our case sites are located), school report cards are published annually with results compared to results of similar schools around the state. Should a school consistently under-perform in terms of the percentage of students reaching mastery on standardized tests, it is subject to sanctions, the most severe being named a School Under Registration Review (SURR). Since specific accountability mandates vary from one state to another, terms such as SURR do not apply universally in the United States, but the basic consequences do, i.e., under-performing schools are publicly identified for sanctions.

Finally, the schools in the United States have been experiencing a marked increase in the racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity of its student body due in great measure to immigration. Almost two-thirds (64)% of all foreign-born residents arrived in the United States subsequent to 1980, most coming from non-English-speaking nations (Spring 2004). It is projected that by 2050 the percent of the overall population that is Hispanic will hit 25% (making it the largest minority group), the percent Black 14%, and the percent Asian 8%. The percent White will decline sharply from the current 76% to 53%. Moreover, the National Condition of Education (NCES 2002) reports that almost 30% of all school age children (5–17 years old) live in households with an annual income below the poverty level; a figure Frankenburg et al. (2003) contend markedly underestimates the magnitude of the problem in urban communities.

1.4.2 Australia

Australia's Commonwealth Government oversees six State and two Territory Governments, and while responsibility for government schooling constitutionally rests with these governments, Commonwealth Government influence has been increasing, as in the United States. Both Tasmania and Victoria, the states in which the Australia case studies are located, have experienced major educational reforms that have increased public accountability. Learning Together (www.education.tas.gov.au/learningtogether) articulates Tasmania's vision and strategic planning framework

for the education, training, and information services within the State. A co-constructed framework for curriculum, learning, teaching, and assessment from birth to Year 10 called Essential Learnings represents the major strategy for achieving many of the Learning Together goals. In Victoria, where since the mid 1970s there has been a relentless succession of reforms that have devolved authority, responsibility, and accountability to the school level, the most recent reform, Blueprint for Government Schools, is aimed at improving literacy, numeracy, retention rates, and successful school completion. Among other things, this reform program proposes to enhance student learning through new curriculum frameworks, improved assessment and reporting, and improved sharing of best practice in teaching and learning (Department of Education and Training 2003). It is now in its second iteration, with early childhood joining to form a new entity the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.

For over two decades, organizational decentralization has been a prominent feature of Australian education and Victoria was a forerunner in the development of school self-management. The 1980s and 1990s witnessed continuous and radical change in Victoria's school system, culminating in the Schools of the Future program in 1993, which introduced large-scale reorganization and the decentralization of numerous functions central to schools, including local selection of staff, control over the school budget, the articulation of school goals in a school charter, and the design of a framework for accountability. By 1997, self-management had been extended to all schools and the Victorian system was regarded as one of the most far-reaching examples of this anywhere in the world. Whilst the extent of self-management has not expanded further, the system can be categorized as a mature system of self-managing schools which operate with supportive leadership, curriculum, and accountability frameworks.

1.4.3 Cyprus

Cyprus has a total population of about 738,000 with about 345 public and 24 private primary schools. Public schools are mainly financed from public funds, while private schools raise their funds primarily from tuition fees. The population of public schools has been very homogeneous up until the entry of Cyprus into the European Union, which led to a rapid increase in multiculturalism and multilingualism. Moreover, during the last few years, the composition of the student body has dramatically changed due to the influx of a significant number of immigrants coming from countries of the former Soviet Union as well as Asia.

Administration in the Cyprus educational system is highly centralized and bureaucratic. Policymaking rests with the Council of Ministers. Overall responsibility for education rests within the Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). The MOEC is responsible for the administration of education laws and, in cooperation with the Office of the Attorney General, the preparation of education bills. There are no local boards in charge of formulating policy or for monitoring its implementa-

tion. The MOEC also prescribes syllabi, curricula, and textbooks. Appointments, secondments, transfers, and discipline of teaching personnel and the inspectorate are the responsibility of the Education Service Commission, a five-member independent body, appointed by the President of the Republic for a period of 6 years. Principals are not consulted about the appointment of personnel or in the allocation of money to their schools. Since the Ministry defines the content of the curriculum, principals and teachers may only give emphasis to selected goals, instructional methods, or engage in European projects.

At the pre-primary, primary, and secondary level, the overall responsibility for supervising the proper functioning of the schools rests with the inspectorate. The inspectorate has the responsibility for the implementation of the government's educational policies for curriculum development and for the appraisal of the teaching personnel. It is also their responsibility to act as advisors and guide the teachers in improving their performance and developing professionally. To this effect, they organize educational seminars of a practical nature at least twice a year.

Recently, the Ministry has publicized a policy document promulgating its intentions for strategic planning in education (Ministry of Education and Culture 2007). The implementation of this planning among other objectives seeks to provide "administrative and educational autonomy to the school units in such a way as to promote the better use of human resources in education." The strategic planning for creating autonomous school units seems to be a promising initiative in laying the foundations for school empowerment and decentralization.

1.4.4 Denmark

The basis of the Danish schooling system are the 1,800 primary and lower secondary school "Folkeschools" (students aged 6–16) that are governed by the Ministry of Education, with a wide range of responsibilities decentralized to the 98 municipalities called, "school owners". In Denmark, 14% of all students attend private schools, some religious, but most educationally specialized.

The twentieth-century Danish comprehensive school evolved out of the development of the Danish welfare state (a largely Social–Democratic project) and a consensus-building dialogue across political parties. The school was looked upon as a vehicle for promoting equal opportunities and as a place for acquiring knowledge, skills, and values that prepare the student for life in a broader sense. This conception evolved with reference to the concept of "Democratic Bildung", a comprehensive vision of schools that are intended to take care of educating children in terms of both subject matter and social and personal competencies. In other words, Democratic Bildung schooling is based on traditional egalitarian and nation-building ideas and inclusive welfare thinking (Moos 2008).

In terms of diversity, the Danish population used to be very homogenous, but for at least the past decade it has become more mixed by waves of immigrants. This is often seen as more of a problem than an opportunity because there is a general

political pressure to make schools more inclusive to all children, at the same time that finances are being cut.

Since the beginning of the 1990s, and at a renewed pace starting in 2001, the Danish educational system has been undergoing a process of thorough transformation under the influence of strong international currents and comparisons, like the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), neo-liberal currents have linked educational thinking very closely to the economy and to neo-conservative trends of back-to-basics, more subject-oriented teaching, re-introduction of accountability in the form of testing at all levels of primary school, and also of other social technologies (Moos 2009). The meaning of leadership, professionals, and learning are thus under profound change. A further example of the major changes that have occurred in Danish education is that the responsibility for finances and administration of the "Folkeskole" was devolved to municipalities and from there to schools in 1992. As a result, school leaders now manage large parts of their budgets in collaboration with their school boards, whose membership must have a parental majority. The Acts themselves, and therefore the responsibility for objectives of the schools, remain in the hands of Parliament and the Ministry of Education, but the interpretations and administration of the curriculum was given to municipalities and to schools, while the accountability system stayed national.

1.4.5 England

While increased accountability has had a major impact on the work of principals/head teachers in all four countries, the earliest of these mandates occurred in England with the 1988 Education Reform Act (ERA). Accountability in ERA lies within a framework of national curriculum goals and standards, high-stakes testing, and open enrollments that use market approaches to reward schools for increased student numbers. ERA introduced Local Management of Schools (LMS), which gave principals greater autonomy over their resources and other school decisions while holding them accountable for the delivery of a national curriculum and for student performance results. School results are now adjusted against a range of socio-economic factors that enable schools to be compared more equitably. The Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED), an independent agency accountable directly to Parliament, inspects schools every 4 years against a national standards framework that reports on school leadership and management, as well as student academic performance. These reports are made public along with examination results that appear as league tables in the press. Schools can be put under review, reconstituted, or closed as a result of these reports.

Since 1997, there has been a raft of changes driven by an impatience to raise academic standards and a concern for inclusion, equity, citizenship, and pupil behavior. Head teachers have had to become entrepreneurs in marketing their schools, while simultaneously implementing mandated strategies and guidelines to improve literacy and numeracy, mainstream students with a range of disabilities and improve student behavior.

A major new initiative is the "Every Child Matters" (ECM) agenda that is intended to ensure closer structural and working arrangements between health, social services, and education through "Children's Centres", "Extended Schools", and other forms of integrated services. This further extends the range of leadership contexts and roles. It is thus little wonder that recent years have seen a sharp decline in the number of applications for headship.

1.4.6 Norway

Though comparable in size to Britain, Norway has only 4.5 million inhabitants. The population is both widely dispersed and largely homogeneous, e.g., approximately 85% of Norwegians belong to the Lutheran State Church. Yet the student population is becoming more multicultural and multilingual due to recent migration, due primarily to work, family reunion, or refuge. By 2005, the immigrant population was just over 8% of the total population, and data from Norwegian hospitals reveal that one out of five births is a child born to one or two immigrant parents. Moreover, this population is not a homogeneous group, with immigrants to Norway coming from 208 different nations, and no single national group constituting more than 7% of the total of the immigrant population (SSB 2006). As a result, the term "students from language minorities" is used in primary and lower secondary education, to refer to students who need personalized instruction in Norwegian to be able to follow regular classes.

During the last 5 years developments in educational policy and reforms in the public sector in general have raised new expectations toward schools, and principals are particularly challenged to respond to new and (sometimes) contradictory expectations. New evaluation procedures have been introduced to produce data about the level of student achievement, and schools are increasingly perceived as the unit of measurement, clearly implying new expectations with regards to public reporting (Møller 2009; Sivesind 2008). Along with this development, the content aims in the national curriculum have been reformulated into competency aims that are easier to evaluate. Furthermore, performance measurement, standards, and accountability have become a central issue of educational reform as a consequence of numerous examples of policy copying among national agencies (Helgøy and Homme 2006). For instance, the huge attention the PISA has received in Norway owes much to the emerging focus on performance measurement and accountability (Elstad 2008). The current movement toward decentralization and local autonomy has stressed the need to establish evaluation procedures in order to gain oversight (Skedsmo 2009). Before it was taken for granted that teachers could be trusted to do a good job, but now there are other social groups who wish to define educational quality, and they also argue for more external regulation of teachers' work.

Currently, the Norwegian educational system is predominantly public with more than 95% of children going to ordinary classes in ordinary schools. Since the national educational policy is intended to create both equal and equitable life condi-

tions for all social groups, regardless of social background, gender, or ethnicity, the question remains as to how well this will continue to be accomplished in light of changing demographics.

1.4.7 Sweden

Compulsory elementary schools were introduced in Sweden in 1842, while the contemporary 9-year, compulsory comprehensive schools came into being in 1962. Since the beginning of the 1960s, educational policy in Sweden has been dominated by an active reform process. The fundamental principles of the Swedish education system include equal access to public sector education for all children, regardless of sex, residential locality, and social and economic circumstances. Equivalent education shall be provided in every type of school, everywhere in the country. Education shall equip pupils with knowledge and skills and, in partnership with their homes, promote their harmonious development into responsible individuals and citizens. Education shall also take into consideration pupils with special needs. All activities in schools shall be designed in keeping with basic democratic values and all persons active in schools shall, in particular, promote equality between the sexes and actively counteract all forms of degrading treatment, such as victimization and racist behavior.

Education in Sweden has the dual task of embracing both a traditional knowledge mandate and a democratic "citizenship" mandate. The School Act states that, "All activity in schools shall proceed in accordance with fundamental democratic values." This is important because it means that all teaching should conform to this regulation.

The municipalities acquired full responsibility for organizing and implementing school activities in 1991. Public sector schooling comes under the Education Act, and municipalities have the responsibilities of an employer toward school staff, as well as responsibility for principal and teacher in-service education. Today, a compulsory school can be organized in various ways; but there has to be a head-teacher. The head teacher is in charge of all educational activity in the school. The head teacher should be familiar with everyday work in the school and promote educational change for school improvement.

In the decentralization process, new demands and expectations were placed on principals. Their overall duties were made very clear in the National Curriculum from 1994. First, the principal is the guarantor for a nationally equivalent education. Every school is required to meet the national standards, regardless of where it is situated geographically and the conditions under which it is working. Second, the principal is guarantor for pupils' and parents' rights as laid out in the National Curriculum. Third, the principal is the guarantor that education in his/her school meets the national quality standards. It is also clearly spelled out that the principal is responsible for leading the development of the educational activities at the local school.

Transferring responsibility for primary and secondary education to the municipality has also meant new and different demands on the superintendent. As head of

the central municipal school office, the superintendent is, much more clearly than before, a key person in the education system. The position carries with it the responsibility to see to that all the schools in the municipality meet the goals and demands set by the state. The shift of power to the municipality also means that new demands are set at the local political level. The superintendent and principals are serving two masters—one national and one local. While decentralization and deregulation of the school system have meant a greater degree of freedom for the superintendent, they have also placed new demands on him/her to take initiatives, make strategic decisions, and lead school development in the municipality.

Since the early 1990s, there has been an on-going political discussion about the quality of Swedish education. Swedish schools still rank high in international studies such as PISA and the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMMS), but there are clear tendencies suggesting that Swedish students are not doing so well anymore and a decline in school results has been observed. The present government—an alliance of conservative parties—has decided to introduce a new State Inspection Agency for schools. The hope is that schools will improve their results due to these state inspections because school leaders will have a better understanding about what needs to be improved. The basic idea is that there shall be support structures in the local school district that can work with schools that do not produce the results the state expects. Sweden has also introduced the so-called "free schools", an alternative form of governance in which schools are free from local political school boards, but must still follow the national curriculum. Free schools are financed the same way as regular schools, but they can use their money without local control. Whether free schools students are getting better grades or if the competition from these free schools has been good to the regular schools is still an open question.

1.5 Closing Comments

These brief national overviews suggest certain transnational commonalities with regard to increasing public accountability, decentralization of governance, and increasing demographic diversity. Yet, fundamental differences in these diverse national contexts impact how educational policy and practice play outs across school sites. In the next chapter, Jacobson and Leithwood explore in greater depth some of the emerging educational trends that have impacted the work of school leaders for at least the past decade. The next three chapters that follow, Chaps. 3–5, will examine, in turn, how school leaders in these triads of national contexts address and implement leadership for organizational learning and capacity building, instructional leadership, and culturally responsive leadership. Then, as indicated earlier, Chaps. 6–8, will consider the practical implications of these findings for improving the preparation of aspiring and current school leaders across each of these three issues. The text ends with a summative analysis and critical overview of the works presented, offering recommendations for further research, policy, and leadership preparation.

References

Apple, M. (1992). The text and cultural politics. *Educational Researcher, 21*(7), 4–19.

Crow, G. (2007). The complex landscape of successful principal practices: An international perspective. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 67–74.

Day, C. (2007). *Successful principalship: International perspectives.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Day, C., Harris, A., Hadfield, M., Tolley, H., & Beresford, J. (2000). *Leading schools in times of change.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Department of Education and Training. (2003). *Blueprint for government schools.* Melbourne: DEandT.

Elstad, E. (2008). Ansvarliggjøringsmekanismer: Når skoleeier eller pressen stiller skoler til ansvar. In G. Langfeldt, E. Elstad, & S. Hopmann (Eds.), *Ansvarlighet i skolen. Politiske spørsmål og pedagogiske svar* (pp. 204–234). Fagernes: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.

Frankenburg, E., Lee, C., & Orfield, G. (2003). *A multiracial society with segregated schools: Are we losing the dream?* The Civil Right Project. www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/reseg03/resegregation03.php.

Giles, C. (2007). Building capacity in challenging US schools: An exploration of transformational leadership practice in relation to organizational learning. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 30–38.

Gurr, D. (2007). Development of school accountability systems in Australia. In L. Smith & D. Riley (Eds.), *Blooming Leadership* (pp. 51–71). Sydney: ACEL.

Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., Di Natale, E., Ford, P., Hardy, R., & Swann, R. (2003). Successful school leadership in Victoria: Three case studies. *Leading and Managing, 9*(1), 18–37.

Hallinger, P. (2004). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329–351.

Helgøy, I., & Homme, A. (2006). Policy tools and institutional change. Comparing education policies in Norway, Sweden and England. *Journal of Public Policy, 26*(2), 141–165.

Jacobson, S. (2007). Leadership for success in high poverty elementary schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice, 23*(1), 3–19.

Jacobson, S., Johnson, L., Giles, C., & Ylimaki, R. (2005). Successful leadership in U.S. schools: Enabling principles, enabling schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 607–618.

Johnson, L. (2007). Rethinking successful school leadership in challenging U.S. schools: Culturally responsive practices in school-community relationships. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 49–58.

Kilpatrick, S., Johns, S., Mulford, B., Falk, I., & Prescott, L. (2002). *More than education:* Leadership for rural school-community partnerships. Canberra: RIRDC Press. http://www.rirdc.gov.au/reports/HCC/02–055sum.html.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice, 34*(3), 159–165.

Leithwood, K. (2005). Understanding successful principal leadership: Progress on a broken front. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 619–629.

Leithwood, K., & Day, C. (2007). *Successful principal leadership in times of change: An international perspective.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2005). What we know about successful school leadership. In W. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda: Directions for research on educational leadership*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Marks, H., & Printy, S. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformation and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 4*(3), 293–331.

Ministry of Education and Culture. (2007). *Strategic planning for schooling*. [In Greek.] http://www.moec.gov.cy. Accessed 21 Dec 2007.

Møller, J. (2009). School leadership in an age of accountability: Tensions between managerial and professional accountability. *Journal of Educational Change, 10*(2), 165–177.
Moos, L. (2008). School leadership for 'Democratic Bildung': Fundamentalist beliefs or critical reflection? *School Leadership and Management, 28*(3), 229–246.
Moos, L. (2009). Hard and soft governance: The journey from transnational agencies to school leadership. *European Educational Research Journal, 8*(3), 397–406.
Mulford, W., Silins, H., & Leithwood, K. (2004). *Educational leadership for organisational learning and improved student outcomes*. Boston: Kluwer.
National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2002). *The condition of education 2002.* Washington: U.S. Government Office.
Sivesind, K. (2008). *Reformulating reform. Curriculum history revisited.* Dissertation for the Degree of Dr. Philos, Faculty of Education, University of Oslo.
Skedsmo, G. (2009). *School governing in transition? Perspectives, purposes and perceptions of evaluation policy.* Dissertation for the degree of PhD, Faculty of Education, University of Oslo.
Spring, J. (2004). *American education* (11th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
SSB. (2006). *Samfunnsspeilet nr. 4.* Oslo: Statistics Norway.
Vedoy, G., & Moller, J. (2007). Successful school leadership for diversity? Examining two contrasting examples of working for democracy in Norway. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 59–71.
Villegas, A., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
Ylimaki, R. M. (2007). Instructional leadership in challenging US schools. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 11–19.
Ylimaki, R. M., & Jacobson, S. (2007, December). Successful school leadership: International perspectives. *International Studies of Educational Administration* (Special Issue).

Chapter 2
Converging Policy Trends

Kenneth Leithwood, Stephen L. Jacobson and Rose M. Ylimaki

In this book's first chapter, the authors (Jacobson and Ylimaki) describe briefly the educational contexts of the seven nations considered in this book, focusing on key economic, social, and cultural factors that distinguish one setting from another. Yet it is the converging commonalities in educational policy that give this work its focus. Specifically, there is a growing understanding that increasing economic interdependence worldwide requires policymakers in any one nation to be attentive to policies formulated and enacted in other nations. Pashiardis (2008), for example, argued that understanding globalization requires a re-definition of relationships between individual nations and the rest of the world, as well as the formation of regional and international networks of nations, particularly for smaller nations hoping to avoid marginalization. As with broader social and economic policies, the educational policies of any one nation should no longer be examined without looking at educational policy worldwide. That said, we enter this discussion fully cognizant of the fact that there are potential shortcomings with such relationships, including the fact that the educational policy decisions of these supra-national entities or analyses often have little to do with local educational realities (Pashiardis 2008). For example, while standardized cross national testing such as TIMSS, which have been used as public accountability measures in many countries, can enable a nation to learn about its subject-specific aggregate performance relative to that of others, it can at the same time contribute actually very little to a fuller understanding of that nation's own educational needs.

Therefore, the objective of this chapter is to examine several converging policy trends that are influencing educational practices worldwide, but particularly in the seven nations this text reports. We are especially concerned with policy convergence around the three central issues of the book, examining sequentially instructional leadership, organizational learning and capacity building, and finally culturally responsive leadership practices. We will also briefly address a convergence of trends related to the pre-service and in-service preparation of school leaders and how this convergence might be influenced by cross-national research.

K. Leithwood (✉)
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto,
Toronto, ON M5S 1V5, Canada
e-mail: kenneth.leithwood@utoronto.ca

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5_2,

2.1 Instructional Leadership[1]

Instructional leadership means many things to many people. But its popularity as an idea has been both prompted and re-inforced by several successive waves of school reform, especially in North America. The early effective schools movement included "strong leadership" among its correlates (e.g., Walker et al. 2007) and the enactments of such leadership often approximated typical definitions of supervision, for example, the principal at the back of the classroom scripting a teachers' lesson and providing detailed feedback at a later point.

More recent reforms driven by the accountability movement in education have placed everyone, including school leaders, "on notice" that the only fully satisfactory justification for what they do is its contribution to student achievement. While England, the United States, and Australia have had strict accountability policies for decades, testing mandates and related accountability pressures are increasing in the Scandinavian countries (Norway, Sweden, and Denmark) and Cyprus. Current legislation in the United States, England, and Australia holds all schools accountable for success with children, regardless of the social contexts in which they are situated.

Specifically, in England, accountability lies within a framework of national curriculum goals and standards, high-stakes testing, and open enrollments that reward schools with additional resources for increased enrollments. As part of national curriculum and testing mandates in the UK (Education Reform Act 1988), schools are inspected every 4 years by the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED), and these inspectors have sweeping powers over leadership and management of the school as well as student academic performance. Inspection reports are made public and examination results are published in league tables in the local and national press. Schools can be put under review, re-constituted, or closed altogether as a result of poor inspections. During the 1990s, similar accountability policies emerged in Australia; however, these policies placed more emphasis on school self-evaluation.

In the United States, all schools now operate in a context of high-stakes testing accountability and public visibility as a result of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (2002), its more recent iteration Race to the Top (2009) and related state-testing mandates. In New York state (where the US study sites described in this chapter are located), school report cards are published annually to track the performance and progress of students on standardized achievement tests and to compare these results with similar schools around the state. Should a school in New York consistently under-perform in relation to the percentage of its students reaching mastery on these standardized tests, it is subject to public sanctions, most notably being named a School Under Registration Review (SURR). Although being a SURR school brings with it additional support and technical assistance, it can also stigmatize a school and its district and potentially cause parents to re-consider where they choose to

[1] Some of this description is based on Leithwood and Duke (1999).

live in order to educate their children, which in turn can have a negative effect on real property values and the fiscal support available to schools in that community. As this volume goes to press, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden are all engaged in the development of accountability policies with regards to testing and student achievement. To meet the ambitious targets for such achievement established by policy, many school and district leaders have re-conceptualized their work as being responsible, however indirectly, for improvements in student academic performance, as well shall see more specifically in subsequent chapters. In fact, many US state policies on leadership preparation include provisions for "instructional" leadership; often defined as academic subject matter expertise, test data analysis skills, and proficiencies in curriculum standards alignment. This latest iteration of instructional leadership has been driven by current and pervasive beliefs about the pre-eminence of classroom instructional improvement as the linchpin in school improvement, coupled with recent evidence about the pedagogical content knowledge needed by teachers to effect large improvements in student achievement. This has given rise to a neo-heroic image of principals' instructional leadership (Nelson and Sassi 2005), an image founded on deep understandings of subject matter content and how to teach it.

What further distinguishes instructional leadership from other approaches is its intention to focus on the behaviors of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students. Many versions of this form of leadership focus additionally on other organizational variables, such as school culture, that are believed to have important consequences for such teacher behavior. This has led Sheppard (1996) to distinguish between "narrow" and "broad" views of instructional leadership. Most conceptions of instructional leadership allocate authority and influence to formal administrative roles, most often the principal or headteacher, assuming as well considerable influence through expert knowledge on the part of those occupying such roles.

While the term instructional leadership is often used more like a slogan or aspiration than a well-specified approach to leadership, there are a few extensively elaborated models including Duke (1987), and Hallinger and his colleagues (e.g., Hallinger and Murphy 1985; Hallinger and McCary 1990). In each case, this orientation to leadership is described along multiple dimensions, each of which incorporates a number of functions or behaviors, and evidence is reviewed concerning the effects of these practices on important outcomes.

The most fully tested of these models, the one developed by Hallinger and his associates consists of three broad categories of leadership practice: defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting school climate. Associated with these broad categories are a total of 21 more specific functions (such as supervising instruction).

Perhaps not surprisingly, while the ISSPP protocol did not address instructional leadership explicitly at the onset, many of the attributes defined by these researchers emerged in the research team analyses across every site, regardless of context. A convergence of neo-liberal discourses that link economic prosperity to education and neo-conservative tendencies toward back-to-basics, subject-oriented teaching

and regular testing regimes may help to explain why so many principals in systems internationally have been influenced to place instructional practices at the very center of their work. This linkage is described in greater detail in Chap. 4.

Collectively, the ISSPP research teams found that schools in every country studied were currently operating under greater accountability and public scrutiny than at any other time in the recent past. With performance outcomes more and more often being determined by standardized testing policies (such as the federal No Child Left Behind Act (2002) in the United States, which require students in grades 3 through 8 in every state to be tested annually, or in Denmark where up until 2006 there were national tests in grade 9 only but now tests in all 9 grades), it seems reasonable and not at all surprising that a convergence in instructional leadership practice would echo this convergence in educational policy.

These converging policy trends and practices in instructional leadership require a similar analysis of policy convergence in the area of organizational learning and capacity building, as it is clear that the work required to improve student performance no matter how it is measured requires the work of many and not just a few. In fact, Ylimaki et al. note a movement in the literature toward more "democratic" or "shared" models of instructional leadership aimed at the common good (e.g., Blase et al. 1995; Gale and Densmore 2003; Hallinger 2003; Lambert 1998) that stress the need for school leaders to foster greater participation on the part of their school communities and to create conditions that encourage teacher empowerment and leadership through individual and collective capacity building. Evidence reported by Louis et al. (2010) provides the most recent support for this focus.

2.2 Organizational Capacity Development

There is now a widely held belief among reformers that improvement in student achievement is unlikely unless significant instructional changes occur in classrooms. For school reform efforts to matter, they need to matter for what teachers do in classrooms. Recent evidence about the size of the contribution to student learning explained by teacher "quality" is the same claim in different clothing. Hattie's (2009) synthesis of evidence on this matter is impressive testimony to the claim, as is recent evidence reported by Heck (2007). Therefore, approaches to organizational capacity development must include both individual- and group or organizational-focused interventions.

By far the largest bulk of evidence about individual capacity development is found in research on teacher professional development. In a recent review of this evidence, Desimone (2009) argues that there is now a consensus in the research about five core features of productive professional development for teachers. According to Desimone's analysis, the conditions for productive professional development include:

1. *Content focus:* this may be the most influential feature of professional development. For teachers, content focus means that the professional development they

experience is about the subject matter they are responsible for teaching along with how best to teach it. This is Shulman's "pedagogical content knowledge."
2. *Active learning:* productive professional development provides opportunities for participants to be actively engaged in their own learning. For teachers, such active learning might include observing an expert teacher, being observed with follow-up feedback, reviewing student work in search of clues for instructional improvement. Problem-based learning, an instructional approach common to leadership development initiatives is another example of active learning.
3. *Coherence:* to produce improvements in practice, professional development should also be consistent with the participants' knowledge and beliefs and have promise for helping participants' engage with their school or district's policies and reform efforts.
4. *Duration:* improvements in practice require, we now know, "requires professional development activities to be of sufficient duration, including both span of time over which the activity is spread" (Desimone 2009, p. 184). This could reasonably mean, for example, focusing on a single theme for a total of 20 hours over the course of a semester.
5. *Collective participation:* productive professional development aimed at building individual capacities is best accomplished through the participation of groups of people from, for example, the same school or district. While the goal is still to build individual capacity, evidence reviewed by Desimone (2009) suggests that the means to that end includes teams of people working together. In other words, these professional development conditions likely apply to those in many other roles (for principals, see Huber 2008; Barnett and Mahoney 2008).

Reform efforts aimed at capacity building are not concerned solely with the capacities of individual organizational members, however. Ideas about collective capacity figure strongly in widespread efforts aimed at building collaborative cultures in schools and nurturing professional communities of practices (or professional learning communities). Lying behind initiatives of this sort is a handful of related conceptual perspectives largely subsumed by theories of community, organizational learning, and more recently knowledge management. The basic premise underlying these perspectives is that, simply put, under the right conditions the *whole can be more than the sum of its parts* or *many heads are better than one*. Results of a best-evidence synthesis of research by Robinson et al. (2009) stressing the significant impact on student achievement of leaders and teachers learning together add weight to the importance of this premise.

Whereas organizational learning always includes individual learning, considerable amounts of individual learning can take place without any organizational learning; organizational learning is not simply the sum of each member's learning. Unlike individuals, organizations do not have brains. They do, however, have "cognitive systems" that permit perception, understanding, storage, and retrieval of information (more about what these are shortly), sometimes in the face of much mobility among individual organizational members. Constructivist views of individual learning conceptualize learning as a process of sense-making in which information from the environment is first perceived then encoded, interpreted, stored, and/or

retrieved for application to some problem. While these learning processes assume mental structures in an individual human brain, organizational learning theory identifies analogues to those structures in the organization. For example, organizations, like individuals, have long-term memories. Documents, files, standard operating procedures, and rulebooks constitute parts of a school or district's long-term memory. So, too, are culture-related understandings among members concerning "how we do things around here." A school's long-term memory is often heavily dependent on staff members' tacit knowledge, something easily lost in the face of significant staff turnover (a challenge that had to be addressed in the American school reported in Chap. 3).

Organizational theorists have identified three strategies for collective learning, distinguished by the source of the information on which each is based. One strategy is trial-and-error learning or experimentation. To be effective, this strategy must untangle the causality of events or difficulties in linking one's actions with observed effects. Failure to do so results in "superstitious" learning—the making of incorrect associations between actions and outcomes. A second strategy is to accept the experiences of others, to actively consider ideas generated from outside the organization (Hedberg 1981; Senge 1990). This strategy can help a school or district to avoid being held hostage by its previous experiences and continuing to enact highly learned practices (e.g., perfunctory types of teacher evaluation) long after they have become unproductive for the organization. Finally, organizations can learn by imitating the behavior of other organizations—a strategy manifesting itself, for example, in direct observation by school staffs of the work of administrators and teachers in schools other than one's own.

As reported in their chapter, Leading Organizational Learning and Capacity Building, Day, Jacobson, and Johansson report that much of what was observed by the research teams in school sites in England, the United States, and Sweden are combinations and permutations of these various strategies, which they refer to as layered leadership, changing expectations, and distributed leadership. This convergence of practices around the development of professional learning communities—intended to transform schools from aggregations of individual educators into teams of learners whose collective focus is on improving the performance of students—is less a set of formal policy initiatives than a commonsense understanding by school leaders across borders that for their schools to succeed, the *whole MUST be more than the sum of its parts*. That said, some countries featured in this volume (e.g., England, the United States, and Australia) have national, state, or district policies aimed at organizational re-structuring into various forms that create teams of learners.

Over the past 20 years, principals in the United States, England, and Australia have also been required to implement organizational reforms aimed at bringing about such things as: increased teacher empowerment; a flattening of the educational governance hierarchy to permit greater site-based management and more parent and community involvement in school decision-making; and greater utilization of emergent information and communication technologies. In England, for instance, along with accountability for student performance, the 1988 Education Reform Act

introduced Local Management of Schools (LMS), giving principals considerable autonomy over the use of resources and other school decisions while holding them directly accountable for results. The early years of LMS were characterized by ambiguity, confusion, and considerable stress, as traditional roles, responsibilities, and duties were re-aligned to add responsibilities for hiring, budgeting, school maintenance, and governance issues previously controlled by local educational agencies.

Organizational decentralization has been a prominent feature of Australian education over the past two decades as well. Victoria (second largest school system) was a forerunner in the development of self-management in schools in Australia and one of the first states to initiate and implement self-managed schools internationally. The 1980s and 1990s witnessed continuous and radical change in the Victorian government school system, culminating in the Schools of the Future program in 1993 which introduced large-scale re-organization and the decentralization of numerous functions central to schools, including local selection of staff, control over the school budget, the articulation of school goals in a school charter and the design of a framework for accountability. By 1997, self-management had been extended to all schools and the Victorian system was regarded as one of the most far-reaching examples of this anywhere in the world. The creation of regional networks of schools is the latest refinement in Victoria's efforts to balance local control with the benefits to be gained through participation in learning communities (2010).

Since the mid 1990s, many US states and school districts have mandated similar forms of self-management. Although specific mandates vary by state and school district in the United States, principals are expected to make decisions with a governance council composed of parents, teachers' union members, and sometimes community members and students. Further, the effectiveness of such approaches appear to depend not only on the abilities of these individual leaders, but on culturally embedded norms, values, and assumptions in each of these countries as well, which leads us to our third and last topic of interest, culturally sensitive leadership.

2.3 Culturally Sensitive Leadership

This movement in the leadership field is a specific reflection of the more general understanding that all leaders work in contexts that are, in some measure, unique and that to be successful leaders need to enact their practices in ways that are sensitive to those contexts. Leadership research concerned with cultural sensitivity is being pursued at both global and local levels, and it is especially pressing in light of marked demographic changes as reported in Chap. 1.

The massive Globe study conducted by House and his colleagues perhaps best exemplifies such global-level leadership research (see House et al. 2004; Chhokar et al. 2007). Pursued within some 62 countries by approximately 179 researchers, this project asked "How is culture related to societal, organizational and leadership effectiveness?" (House et al. 2004, p. xv). This large series of studies first measured

key cultural values and practices associated with individual countries and framed along the lines of Hofsted's (1981) conception of national cultural differences likely to be consequential for leaders. These cultural differences, nine in total, include, for example, power distance, gender egalitarianism, uncertainty avoidance. Results of this immense project clarify the relationship between different leadership models and practices.

Somech's review of evidence concerned with participatory decision-making (PDM) in schools helps to illustrate how understandings about national cultural contexts are beginning to help refine some important questions of concern to educational leadership researchers. Somech (2010) claims that the majority of cross-cultural scholars have identified individualism—collectivism as the most important aspect of national culture in efforts to better understand variables that influence PDM and its effects on teachers and students. More specifically:

> Individualistic cultures emphasize self-reliance, autonomy, control, and priority of personal goals, which may or may not be consistent with in-group goals. By contrast, in collective cultures people will subordinate their personal interests to the goals of their in-group…. Pleasure and satisfaction [for such people] derive from group accomplishment. (p. 193)

The general import of Somech's analysis is to remind us that national cultural values are potentially powerful antecedents and moderators of leadership practices often believed to travel well across many different organizational and cultural contexts.

At the local level, culturally sensitive leadership research is typically pre-occupied with whether and how leaders in culturally diverse schools and communities understand, acknowledge, and build on such diversity. Do leaders and their colleagues behave and honor a majority set of values (e.g., middle class, Anglo) not fully or even partially reflecting the values of their students and families? What influence does this have on the educational experiences of students and families? How can leaders become more sensitive to minority cultural values and work with their colleagues to reflect that sensitivity in the teaching and learning that transpires in their schools? These are questions pursued by critical theorists who argue that schools often act to simply reproduce the dominant cultural values and do not view diversity as a strength to be built on for all students. Other leadership researchers (e.g., Dantley and Tillman 2010; Ryan 2006) aim to identify what it is that leaders can do that will begin to create more cultural sensitivity in schools and exploit the educational opportunities available in that diversity.

In their chapter later in this volume, Johnson, Møller, Pashiardis, Vedøy, and Savvides attempt to do just that through their examination of "culturally responsive leadership" (Ladson-Billings 1995; Johnson 2006, 2007) and "leadership for democratic education" (Møller 2006; Vedøy and Møller 2007) found in schools in the United States, Norway, and Cyprus. Although the authors report a marked increase in student diversity in each of the three nations; they also find context-specific differences in the policy frameworks that have been implemented. Norway and Cyprus, for example, are concerned primarily with cultural and language diversity, with Norway pointedly emphasizing the importance of maintaining principles of democracy. In the United States, however, such policies have more to do

with race than culture or language, and there is less effort to promote pluralism. In fact, policies about diversity in the United States have more often been decided by litigation than legislation (Johnson et al.). In other words, it is harder to identify a policy convergence in leadership for cultural sensitivity than for either instructional leadership or organizational capacity building, and therefore harder to define successful leadership for diversity, especially when school leaders think that their success in increasing student achievement may be compromised by their efforts to integrate diverse student populations into the mainstream. This tension about leadership practices potentially working at cross purposes segues nicely into our final concern, which is, how can school leaders be appropriately prepared to address each of these three issues?

2.4 Preparing Current and Future School Leaders

There is a growing body of empirical research that supports the contention that leadership matters when it comes to improving student achievement and school effectiveness (Leithwood et al. 2004). Moreover, much of this work has deepened our understanding of what it is that successful school leaders actually do to contribute both directly and indirectly to the improvement of student learning (Jacobson and Bezzina 2008; Leithwood and Riehl 2003). As a result of this research, considerable attention worldwide has been turned to improving the preparation of school leaders, particularly principals, in order to provide them the skills and knowledge base needed to address the challenges they face. In the United States, for example, millions of dollars have been expended in recent years by a variety of sources including the US Department of Education, numerous state education departments, and major private foundations such as Broad and DeWitt Wallace, to better understand the preparation and practice of school leaders. Major investments have been made in England as well, with the creation of the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) at the University of Nottingham and the development of a curriculum and system of qualification for aspiring leaders.

Although the requirement of pre-service qualifications for school leaders is a relatively new phenomenon in the England, formal pre-service preparation has a long history in the United States, with the first programs appearing in the early twentieth century (Brundrett 2001). Currently, there are over 500 pre-service educational administration preparation programs in the United States and Canada.

Teachers can still obtain an administrative posting without having completed a prior training program in the other countries studied but, as a result of the convergence in the research literature on school leadership, there has been an increased emphasis on improving the practice of current school administrators across all contexts, primarily through on-going professional development activities, often times at the university.

While much of this interest in preparation has been spurred by the literature on successful leadership, there has also been concern that increased accountability

and the plethora of responsibilities being heaped upon school leaders, especially principals and headteachers, have become so onerous and unwieldy as to make the role increasingly unattractive. Mulford (2003) enumerates a laundry list of reasons for the decline in interest in school leadership across nations, including but not limited to: long hours; budget cuts; overcrowding, a shortage of qualified teachers; an unsupportive external environment; governmental mandates that are sometimes seen as unnecessary; time fragmentation that often does not allow the opportunity for professional reflection and family life; the difficulties of working with children living in poverty who do not have adequate health care; "the pressures of unrelenting change which is not necessarily to education's advantage" (Mulford, p. 30); and, perhaps most discouraging of all for those who are really committed to the work, "the perception that education has become a economic/political football in which the principalship is not valued" (Mulford, p. 31).

Frustrations with increased accountability coupled with the tightening fiscal constraints under which systems worldwide now must operate and it is small wonder that many school leaders are experiencing tremendous job-related stress (Jacobson 2005). Improving preparation, whether pre- or in-service, will hopefully enable school leaders to not only work smarter but also to more fully understand the complexity of the roles they have taken on. In the latter part of this text, each triad of authors will consider the implications for preparation derived from their respective analyses of instructional leadership, organizational learning and capacity building, and culturally responsive leadership.

References

Barnett, B., & Mahoney, G. (2008). Mentoring and coaching programs for the professional development of school leaders. In J. Lumby, G. Crow, & P. Pashiardis (Eds.), *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 232–262). New York: Routledge.

Blase, J., Blase, J., Anderson, G. L., & Dungan, S. (1995). *Democratic principals in action: Eight pioneers*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

Brundrett, M. (2001). The development of school leadership preparation programmes in England and the USA: A comparative analysis. *Educational Management & Administration, 29*(2), 229–245.

Chhokar, J., Brodbeck, F., & House, R. (2007). *Culture and leadership, across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. Mahwah: Erlbaum.

Dantley, M., & Tillman, L. (2010). Social justice and moral transformative leadership. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice* (pp. 19–34). Boston: Allyn Bacon.

Desimone, L. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher, April 38,* 181–199.

Duke, D. (1987). *School leadership and instructional improvement*. New York: Random House.

Gale, T., & Densmore, K. (2003). Democratic educational leadership in contemporary times. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 6*(2), 119–136.

Hallinger, P. (2003, January). *Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership*. Paper presented at the annual International Congress for School Effectiveness and School Improvement, Nottingham, England.

Hallinger, P., & McCary, C. (1990). Developing the strategic thinking of instructional leaders. *Elementary School Journal, 91*(2), 89–107.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal, 86*(2), 217–247.
Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning*. London: Routledge.
Heck, R. (2007). Examining the relationship between teacher quality as an organizational property of schools and students' achievement and growth rates. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43,* 399–432.
Hedberg, B. (1981). How organizations learn and unlearn. In P. C. Nystrom & W. H. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational learning: Volume 1. Adapting organizations to their environments*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Hofsted, G. (1981). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
House et al. (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations: The Globe study of 62 societies*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Huber, S. (2008). Preparing school leaders: International approaches in leadership development. In M. Huber (Ed.), *School leadership: International perspectives.* Dordrecht: Springer.
Jacobson, S. (2005). The recruitment and retention of school leaders: Understanding administrator supply and demand. In N. Bascia, A. Cumming, A. Datnow, K. Leithwood, & D. Livingstone (Eds.), *International handbook of educational policy* (pp. 457–470). London: Kluwer.
Jacobson, S., & Bezzina, C. (2008). The effects of leadership on student academic/affective achievement. In G. Crow, J. Lumby, & P. Pashiardis (Eds.), *The international handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 80–102). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
Johnson, L. (2006). "Making her community a better place to live": Culturally responsive urban school leadership in historical perspective. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5*(1), 19–37.
Johnson, L. (2007). Rethinking successful school leadership in challenging U.S. schools: Culturally responsive practices in school-community relationships. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 49–58.
Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491.
Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria: ASCD.
Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. (1999). A century's quest for a knowledge base: 1976–1998. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd ed., pp. 45–72). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What do we already know about successful school leadership?* Prepared for the AERA Division A Task Force on Developing Research in Educational Leadership.
Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning.* New York: Wallace Foundation.
Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Final report of research.* New York: Wallace Foundation.
Møller, J. (2006). Democratic schooling in Norway: Implications for leadership in practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5*(1), 53–69.
Mulford, B. (2003). School leaders: Changing roles and impact on teacher and school effectiveness. A paper commissioned by the Education and Training Policy Division, OECD, for the activity *Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers.*
Nelson, B., & Sassi, A. (2005). *The effective principal: Instructional leadership for high quality learning.* New York: Teachers College Press.
No Child Left Behind Act. (2002). Stronger accountability for stronger results. www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml. Accessed 28 Sep 2003.
Pashiardis, P. (2008, September). The dark side of the moon: Being locally responsive to global issues. Keynote presentation at the CCEAM conference, Durban, South Africa.
Robinson, V., Hohepa, M., & Lloyd, C. (2009). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why*. New Zealand: New Zealand Ministry of Education.
Ryan, J. (2006). *Inclusive leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline.* New York: Doubleday.

Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership, *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 18*(4), 325–344.

Somech, A. (2010). Participative decision making in schools: A mediating-moderating analytic framework for understanding school and teacher outcomes, *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(2), 174–209.

Vedøy, G., & Møller, J. (2007): Successful school leadership for diversity? Examining two contrasting examples of working for democracy in Norway. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 58–67.

Walker, A., Hallinger, P., & Qian, H. (2007). Leadership development for school effectiveness and improvement in East Asia. In T. Townsend (Ed.), *International handbook on school effectiveness and school improvement* (pp. 659–680). Dordrecht: Springer.

Chapter 3
Leading Organisational Learning and Capacity Building

Christopher Day, Stephen L. Jacobson and Olof Johansson

Increasingly, the building of personal, interpersonal and organisational capacity through the restructuring and reculturing of schools as learning organisations and professional learning communities have been identified as promising developments in school-based administrative theory (Louis et al. 1996; Senge 2000; Mitchell and Sackney 2000). Yet capacity-building theories are complex and require administrators to be conversant with new approaches to leadership, change theory, instruction and professional development, whilst maintaining that which is already effective within schools (Silins et al. 2002). The purpose of this chapter is to explore the capacity-building strategies used by principals and headteachers to improve and sustain improvements in student achievement in US, English and Swedish contexts.

Whereas the literature about leadership is replete with writing about values, expectations, structures, strategies, and roles and responsibilities, there is much less which focuses upon the relationships between these and the purposes and forms of capacity building. For example, is the purpose of capacity building primarily the empowerment of individuals and groups or, more instrumentally, to increase their effectiveness in the classroom in order to improve student results in terms of measurable tests or examinations? To what extent do the "distributed" leadership (Sweden), "layered" leadership (England) or "changing expectations"(U.S.) strategies described in this chapter illustrate different purposes which, themselves, reflect not only the experiences, expertise and dispositions of the individual leadership but also the culturally embedded norms, values and assumptions in each of these countries? Moreover, what is the contribution of capacity building to the growth and maintenance of professional learning communities which support trust, distributed leadership and learner autonomy for leaders, teachers and students. This chapter will, therefore, explore these relationships in the context of the work of successful school leaders and the interface among leadership, organisational and individual capacity building and trust. The chapter will provide illustrations, using data drawn from the extensive qualitative database of three (England, USA and Sweden) of the

C. Day (✉)
School of Education, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK
e-mail: christopher.day@nottingham.ac.uk

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5_3,

15 countries who participate in the International Successful School Principals' Project (ISSPP), of the ways in which principals have built organisational learning as a means of moving their schools in the direction of becoming professional learning communities as a key part of their agenda for school improvement.

Organisational learning is a term which education has borrowed from the business literature. It refers to the capacity of an organisation to learn (Senge 1990). More recently, the term has been modified to fit the aspirations of educational organisations to become professional learning communities (Vescio et al. 2008, pp. 80–91). This term is more appropriate, because schools are charged by governments with person, social and instrumental purposes, processes and outcomes all of which are regarded as essentials. In this, they are different from business. The extent to which they are able to achieve these will relate to the extent to which they are able to develop a collective sense of purpose, authentic relationships, and principles of practice to which all in their communities subscribe. In other words, how well schools function as communities of values and their application in practice is intimately related to how well they achieve their personal, social and instrumental purposes.

> The indications are that the successful restructuring agenda depends in terms of leaders, whole staff and school personnel, working together in genuine collaboration. The challenges these groups face require significant development of their collective, as well as their individual capacities. (Mulford et al. 2004, p. 2)

Professional learning communities are grounded in five assumptions:

1. Knowledge is situated in daily lived experiences of teachers and others who work in schools and understood best when these are reflected upon critically both alone and with others who share these experiences.
2. Engaging teachers (and others who work with students) in critical reflection and collaboration will increase their professional knowledge and skills, enhance their commitment to their work, the work of the school as a whole, and increase their capacities to be resilient. These will lead to improved student learning and achievement.
3. Effective professional learning involves examination and development of the head, the hand and the heart. Emotional engagement is at the heart of effective learning.
4. Professional learning communities are characterised by distributed leadership and trust in teachers' pedagogical judgements.
5. School leaders, especially principals, play a key role in the promotion of organisational learning.

In discussing the extent to which organisational learning forms a part of successful principals' practices, therefore, we will examine its relationship with their aspiration for their schools to become learning communities for all (the word "professional" in "professional learning communities" we take to refer to the quality of the learning rather than one particular occupational group within the school community). The use of the word "aspiration" is an acknowledgement that the ideal of a professional learning community may never fully be achieved, since each year the student population will be subject to change and it is likely to face new challenges

as a consequence of external demands for changes in governance and curricula. In some schools that serve disadvantaged communities, it is likely that both staff and student mobility will be high and that educational challenges, which relate directly to the composition of external communities, are likely to be constant. Yet all school communities rely for their well-being upon the emotional as well as intellectual quality of interaction between members and must achieve forms of stability which enable the continued growth and achievement of their members. Such stability, however temporary, may be achieved at an individual level, or even among small groupings (e.g. subject departments), but is unlikely to be achieved at the level of the organisation without the effective leadership and management of the principal, his/her senior leadership team and other designated leaders. However, stability is a relative term and may, if left unexamined for long periods, lead to complacency which itself may lead to stagnation.

> Schools as organisations contain both a need for change and disorderliness, also a demand for stability and a cohesive story about "where we have been and where we are going". Schools need to engage in fundamental and risky learning, and they need to organise themselves into communities of caring and trust. (Leithwood and Louis 1998a, p. 283)

Organisational learning, then, will be characterised by opportunities for capacity building and differentiated continuing individual development for teachers in different phases of their professional learning lives and in relation to changing organisational needs (Day et al. 2007). The dual challenges for all school leaders are: (1) to create and enhance conditions which will enable all within them to have a sense of individual and collective vision and purposes, to feel secure in the means by which such vision and purposes may be achieved and feel ownership of the change processes in which they will inevitably be involved; and (2) at the same time to engage them in processes of learning and development, some of which will cause them both to interrogate vision at regular intervals, upgrade knowledge and skills, revisit roles and relationships and review and renew motivation and commitment to the students and the organisation.

3.1 What Is a Professional Learning Community (PLC)?

In a large-scale, multi-site study in England, Bolam and his colleagues defined a PLC as a community, "with the capacity to promote and sustain the learning of all professionals in the school community with the collective purpose of enhancing student learning" (Bolam et al. 2005, p. 145). This definition builds on the earlier work of Newmann et al. (1996), Louis and Marks (1998) and Dufour (2004) in the USA who identify PLCs as those which place an emphasis upon (1) shared norms and values; (2) consistent focus upon student learning; (3) reflective dialogue among teachers; (4) de-privatisation of practices; and (5) a focus upon collaboration. They might have added at least three more which research suggests are essential to building and sustaining "community", "learning and achievement" and "teacher quality"; (6) values-led transformational leadership (Leithwood et al. 2007); (7) teacher com-

mitment and resilience (Day et al. 2007); and (8) trust (Bryk and Schneider 2003; Fullan 2003; Robinson 2007; Louis 2007). In Sweden, Björkman (2008) found that principals in more successful secondary schools viewed their schools as more team-based according to internal collaboration forms and staff development and having a more involving leadership, than do principals in the less successful schools. In PLC, organisational communication plays a vital role both in the way meetings and agenda are structured and how communication culture is developed. Organisational communication processes that allow different opinions, knowledge and experience contribute to sense-making and a mutual understanding (Weick 1995; Ärlestig 2008).

In the next part of the chapter, we provide three illustrations of aspects of organisational learning which are fundamental to successful school development and student achievement. The first, from Sweden, provides a contextually rich illustration of the importance of a distributed leadership strategy; the second, from England, provides an example of the importance of diagnosing need and the selection and differentiated and progressive use of "fit for purpose" strategies and habits of mind (Senge 2000) over time in order to lead a "failing" school to success, and the third focuses upon changing expectations in a U.S. school.

3.1.1 Distributed Leadership

Mulford et al. (2004) identified four factors which contribute to organisational learning in the Australian Secondary Schools which they studied: "collaborative climate, taking initiatives and risks, shred and monitored mission, and professional development" (p. 238). Moreover, in these schools, a "condition of note" (p. 239), which they found explained variations in organisational learning between the schools was "the process of distributing leadership…so that a wider range of sources of leadership is identified by teachers" (Mulford et al. 2004, p. 239).

In Sweden, at the end of the 1990s, the question of distributed leadership or a common collective responsibility for the success of all students was the focus for the wage negotiations between the Association of local authorities and the trade unions for principals and teachers. The bid from the association for local authorities was that principals and teachers should, over a 3-year period, get a substantial raise in their salaries. In return, the principals and teachers had 3 years to change their pedagogical work with children in their school. The main points of the required change were:

(a) Teachers should work in teams in relation to a group of students.
(b) Teachers should be in the school at least 35 hours per week during semester time.
(c) The principal can direct and plan these hours and normally 17–19 hours were contact hours with students and the rest was for planning, conferences and in-service training.
(d) Teachers should also work 10 more hours every week during the semesters with their own preparations.

This agreement was summarized in a document called Agreement 2000. The text was divided into two different sections. The first is a text that in ideological and pedagogical terms describes the changes in teaching that were required and the second half is the technical wage agreement. The interesting part, in relation to distributed leadership, is the first pedagogical text that is very ideological in style and describes a change in teaching methods and school culture. Through the reform, every student should get more contact time with the teachers. Also, teachers from the team would substitute for short absences from work by other team teachers. This change in planning behaviour was calculated in relation to the raise in salaries and should help the school districts finance the reform. The principal's leadership became very important for the implementation and success of the reform. Today, most successful schools with excellent student outcomes are organised with teacher teams following the intention in agreement 2000.

In the Swedish part of ISSPP we have many examples of how the work in teacher teams has created a culture in which the teams and principals work together. The most visible change in behaviour has been identified in the way leadership is conducted by principals. In the successful schools, principals' leadership focuses on collaboration with the teacher teams. This can also be described as democratic leadership for achieving the best possible student outcomes. One example of this type of principal work is from Eriksson Secondary School.

The study at Eriksson Secondary School makes visible the power of actively and sincerely identifying, embracing and facing problems and demands as natural friends and putting shame and blame aside through creating a collaborative leadership structure. The positive disposition of problems provides a solid base for continuous school improvement, since problems are acknowledged both by the teacher teams and principals as drivers for necessary improvements. This story of success is an important example on how difficult problems and dilemmas that are part of daily life can be solved when the leadership responsibilities are distributed and acknowledged as a common responsibility in the school. Significantly, change was identified as being the vision that encouraged and supported the positive collaboration between teacher teams and principals in reaction to and resolution of demands and problems (Törnsén 2009).

In another of our schools, the principal describes his approach to leadership as distributed with a focus on involving as many people as possible in the work of improving the school. In the principal's view stimulating participation in school improvement from teachers, pupils and parents is at the core of leadership. The principal is highly visible in the school and has the intention of meeting all staff and pupils every week. The impression from the teachers, according to the principal, is that the running of the school takes place during the coffee breaks. This openness is combined with clear and strict logistics for the work in school. The core of the work is the Consultation Team. It includes the principal and one representative from each of the teaching teams, meeting once a week. All the work in school is built on five founding visions, in relation to national and local objectives. The principal, the teachers, the pupils and the parents developed these ideas when the school started 5 years ago. One of the ideas is at the core of the work each year. When the

research team visited the school the yearly work was concentrated on developing a constructive alignment in the K-9 perspective in all subjects and for children with special needs. In the principal's views the school is directed by joy. There is a lot of laughter and at the same time clear leadership. Teachers have faith in their principal (Björkman 2008).

In the two successful schools we revisited 5 years after our first visit, we found very strong teacher teams. Five years ago, the principals in both schools had introduced teacher teams and worked hard at creating a collaborative culture between the leadership and the teams based on distributed leadership theories. This approach has been very successful and the two schools remained high performing schools even after the principals had left—about 2 years after our first visit.

The unexpected effect of these two excellent teams was that they did not accept their incoming principals. According to team members, the new principals did not have the leadership style they expected. The new principals could not live up to the teams' expectations and both principals had left just before our second visit to the school—5 years after the first visit. The school districts' reaction to this situation was to let representatives from the teacher teams serve on the selection committee for the incoming principals. What the teacher teams wanted were principals who were visible and worked through distributed leadership, but complemented that with a collaborative and supportive style of leadership. They did not want to have a distribution of leadership and responsibility without collaboration and support from the principal. They also wanted a principal interested in pedagogical matters, one able to communicate and have a dialogue around the vision for the school (Höög and Johansson 2009).

These examples illustrate clearly that distribution of leadership, in and of itself, is not enough! The teachers in our four schools accepted the distribution of leadership responsibility, but they did not want to be left alone. Rather, they saw distributed leadership as a new form of collaborative leadership and they embraced the increase in responsibility and expressed that the new style of sharing responsibility in the schools between the principal and the teacher teams led to improved student outcomes. In conclusion, they wanted the distributed style of responsibility that was agreed upon in Agreement 2000, but they emphasised that a pre-request for successful distributed leadership is trust and a good working relationship between the principal and the teacher teams. Agreement 2000 has been the necessary prerequest for many principals in Sweden to introduce a collaborative and distributed style of leadership and through that approach build successful schools with excellent student outcomes.

Distributed leadership is difficult! Many times distributed leadership is described as a new style that every principal can handle. The examples above clearly demonstrate that other leadership skills must also be in place if the leadership method has to be successful. Agreement 2000 required teachers to work in teams, but in many of schools teacher teams became just a paper construction. The main reason so many did not work well was that the distribution of leadership and responsibility alone was not enough. To be successful, such change must be accompanied by a

leader who can create trust and good relations with his staff through collaborative and supportive leadership.

3.1.2 Organisational Learning: A Layered Approach

This English inner-city elementary school principal provides an example of the ways in which her educational values were practised through the timely use of a combination of strategies over time which were founded upon a conviction that a focus upon enhancing the emotional and cognitive learning of both staff and students would lead to tangible rewards. Tangible rewards include enhanced well-being, engagement and commitment which themselves would be the result of improved performance and in response to the progressive accumulation and combination of fit for purpose improvement strategies which, taken together, were more than the application of those associated with particular theoretical models of leadership.

The Past

> It's a lovely school, and it's full of colours. As soon as you come in you see pictures of people, the aims of the school…As you walk around the school, there's an order in the classrooms and you can see there's a purpose…so that as soon as the children come in, they know what to do…in the staffroom you see people cutting things out…and just generally there's a buzz…The feeling is one of optimism… (Principal)

When Jan was first visited in 2002, she had been principal of the 203 pupil Infant and Nursery (3–7-year-olds) School for 5 years. The school was situated in an area of high socio-economic deprivation and drew its population from a large public housing (white, working class) development situated on the edge of an urban conurbation. Forty per cent of children were from single-parent backgrounds and 48% received free school meals (used as a proxy indicator of deprivation). The area had a high level of crime, much of this drug-related. Children were often seen out in the streets in the night, did not get enough sleep, and/or came to school without breakfast. Attendance was, "the fourth worst in the city" (Principal).

Jan had begun teaching in the early 1970s, always within schools serving disadvantaged communities. Immediately prior to this she had been vice principal in two inner-city schools.

> I came and looked around the school and it was very obvious there was no order and no core school approaches for anything…and I just though I could something with it.

Jan had replaced a principal of 25 years standing and described the school as being, "in a bit of a time warp". Indeed, an external inspection report in the year before her arrival had placed the school in the category of "Serious Weaknesses" with 60% of teaching judged to be poor or unsatisfactory. When she arrived, she had focused upon providing a secure, structured environment for the pupils (as a contrast with

home) involving parents more closely in the life of the school (previously they had "not been allowed in the school").

> I think it's really important, because their values are not necessarily the same as mine.

She had introduced school uniform and encouraged the teachers to work in teams within agreed whole-school systems, for example, for reading and writing (previously each class teacher had their own reading scheme books):

> I think you have to go with people's strengths. I do try and think about other people, which is why I don't force things through. However, I've got strong views. So we actually timetable very tightly…place a high emphasis on expecting that the children in our school can achieve high standards in literacy and numeracy…we make sure we use every available moment of the day…and…one of the things we've done this year (2002) is to recognise that the curriculum mustn't be narrow. We've given a responsibility point (financial incentive) to a teacher for acting as an enrichment curriculum co-ordinator.

In summary, in 2002, Jan's success, like those of other successful principals in the ISSPP participating countries, had been achieved through the application of a set of principal values which emphasised equity, care, and achievement within the development of inclusive partnerships:

> My view is that these children deserve the same quality of education, the same opportunities as those in schools which serve more advantaged communities…and that although this school is predominantly white, we are in a multi-cultural society.

Jan had described her job as being to "create the climate where teachers can teach well…have the resources and support" and…"which gives the children the feeling of I-can-do. We've managed to create a culture where people expect the children to achieve". She had systems for monitoring individual children's progress, played a lead role in the analyses of their test results and matched members of the teaching teams for "personality, interests, strengths and experience". She ignored the negatives and developed and dwelled upon the positives.

> You've got to accept that some people are always going to be the sort of people who are what I call drains. You have radiators and drains. I keep going until we get there. I don't think I'm hard. I think I can pick up on people's moods and see if somebody is down. Put it this way, if you measure people's attitudes to work by their absences, staff attendance is very high.

A key strategy in climate and expectation setting was an emphasis on performance development portfolios for staff which enabled the planning and recording of professional development activities and which were used as a key part of annual performance management (appraisal) meetings. As with other successful principals, she was "ahead of the game" (for example, introducing a foreign language as part of the curriculum years before it became government policy), innovative (using teaching assistants in different ways as teaching "partners", organising courses for parents) and encouraged her staff to learn from the best practice of others outside the school. Importantly, as with others, too, she was measured in her use of change, recognising that:

> As a class teacher, there's so much to do, but you haven't got the energy to do new things all the time. I'm very against people working for the sake of paperwork. I'd do anything that I'm asking anybody to do. But I'm not always wanting to change because I think change

> and change and change is very draining on the staff…I like to take people with me rather than impose, so virtually all decisions that are taken by the school, or by me as a leader, are first taken to staff and governors…but if it's something crucial than I will just do it if I decide to. So I'm patient, but I'm a bit of a terrier in that I won't forget, I will come back to something if I think it is a good idea but not the right time for the staff.

By 2001, the school had become designated as a "Beacon" school, i.e. one that others might visit as an example of good practice. Yet, when the pupils joined from Nursery, their level of attainment was, according to Jan, below the expected level particularly in language and communication skills for a 3-year-old:

> …We also have behaviour problems because of young mums who don't have parenting skills which are well developed and because of constant changes and transitions in their lives.

Staff, parents and pupils described the school as "unrecognisable…a completely different place now to the way it was" (Teacher). The school now had, "more learning support systems, the same systems in each class for reading and writing, high expectations and pupil outcomes in tests which improved each year". Staff felt known and valued. They described Jan as strong, approachable, available, hard working, down to earth, well organised, with a clear vision. Her style was, "to listen and go with the majority" (Teacher) but she was "single minded" in her pursuit of improvement.

3.2 Sustaining Success

> Once you've got the standards right, that's a great release, because then you can focus on things which are really exciting.

Six years later, in 2008, we revisited Jan. She was still working on the same campus, but now as principal of the newly amalgamated Nursery, Infant and Junior schools. At the end of the 2006–2007 school year, both the infant and nursery school and adjacent junior school were closed, and reopened as a primary school at the beginning of the 2007–2008 school year. Jan and the principal of the junior school both applied for the principalship of the new school, and Jan was appointed. All staff at both the junior and infant schools had to reapply for positions. This process was described as "very painful" by the principal because some key staff members did not get jobs in the new primary school (for example, the deputy principals at both the infant and junior schools did not get jobs in the new primary school).

In contrast to the infant and nursery school, the adjacent junior school had not been as successful in terms of pupil outcomes over the past 6 years, and Jan had faced a considerable number of challenges in amalgamating the staff and students from the two schools, together with improving standards within Key Stage 2 (pupils aged 7–11). According to Jan, after less 1 year of her principalship the new primary school was not yet "successful". The interviews during our visit to the school, therefore, focused both on her successful leadership of previous infant and junior school in the years since our last visit, and how she was working to transfer those leader-

ship strategies to the new primary school. She noted that the leadership style and strategies she was using now were very similar to those she used when she became the principal of the infant and nursery school, as this school had also not been successful before she had become the principal.

The Infant and Nursery school had continued a steady improvement, with regard to the standard of teaching and learning, parental engagement, and student achievement in the national SATs tests. In 2000, Ofsted rated the school as "very good" and in 2005, as "outstanding".

> I would say we definitely sustained success in more ways than one. We've maintained the success around SATs and so on, that's been very good. And we've had another Ofsted since you last visited and we got, "outstanding" for that. So if you use those indicators, we've done well.

However, success had been achieved in other ways too. For example, there had been a national government initiative to introduce "teaching assistants" into classrooms in order to support the teacher. This had been part of the Workforce Remodelling initiative (Date & Ref). Jan's was the only school in the district that had been identified as implementing this initiative in innovative and effective ways. Teaching assistants had taken on more classroom responsibilities, releasing teachers to do other things. Jan had also given staff 10% noncontact time 3 years before it had been introduced nationally.

> Each authority (school district) identified a school where they thought teaching assistants and support staff have moved on faster than others. We were asked to be an "Early Adopter" school. And that's a real credit to the teaching assistants…

Another activity that Jan had encouraged was lunchtime and after school clubs.

> What they have tended to do is to pay our TAs to do that. We developed an excellent programme and what made them successful was that they were well managed (by TAs). Each club ran for 8 weeks only, and the class were part of the TAs own interests.

This whole-school responsibility had enhanced the status of TAs within the school.

The school had also won a national award in 2006 for its work with parents.

> This (name) teaching assistant (TA) has been running the SHARE group for three years now and we target parents of the nursery children (aged 3–5 years). It's once each week for about 20 weeks and the first year she ran it with 12 parents. To keep those parents on board is pretty amazing. Then we did it for a second year and it was suggested to us that we should submit the school for an award…and we won…!

Among other developments had been the establishment of a school council and participation in a national "creative partnerships" initiative through which professional artists, actors and musicians would spend extended periods working in the school.

> The project we had last year (Jan's last as principal of the Infant school only) was about transition and bringing together children from the junior and infant schools.

So the values and strategies that were present when we had first visited the school had remained and been further developed. However, Jan's real strength resided in the strength of the relationships with had been built early on, nurtured and further developed. Strategies, she said, were in themselves less important.

> Relationships…is absolutely huge. This might seem really negative, but some people will never be really successful at relationships. They can learn strategies, but they will be the ones who struggle, no matter how much good practice they see, how much training they have…maybe it's a lack of warmth. I say to teachers, "you can say exactly what you mean (in school) and…you need to love your class, every child. If you've got one that drives you barmy (mad), you've got to find something in them to love…Pupils need warmth as well as discipline. I think you have to model it…Building up the team as well…when you employ somebody, you look for that warmth".

As in the first visit, Jan also emphasised the importance of "taking people with me", "working with people" and, through this, avoiding confrontation; though that was time-consuming in some cases. A teaching assistant who was also a parent and governor of the school related an incident which provides an illustration of Jan's interpersonal qualities:

> She is approachable. I remember my youngest daughter's first day at school…and bearing in mind I'd had two others come through with no problems, I had to leave her screaming hysterically in the classroom because she didn't want to stay. I was upset, and I can remember Jan said, "Come and sit in my office".

Jan's persistence in engaging parents in the life of the school had remained, also. One of her teachers gave an example of this:

> She does lots of assemblies (whole school meetings) where parents are invited. Once every term, parents are invited in to hear the children's achievements.

Whilst this section has focused upon how Jan sustained and further nurtured the success of the school, it is interesting to note how she transferred her values and vision, strategies and relationships into her work as principal of the new amalgamated school. Table 3.1 was constructed as a result of further interviews with Jan and staff of what had been the junior school and provides some evidence in support of the argument that principals who are successful in one school context as a result of their values, qualities and strategies may transfer these into another, similar context, and meet with the same degree of success.

In both schools, this principal, acted consistently to promote key values, high engagement of staff and parents through inclusive partnerships, data informed (rather than data led) discussions about pupil progress and achievement, and whole-school policies on behaviour and teaching and learning which ensured a sense of structure and security alongside continuity and progression. She remained innovative in terms of curriculum enrichment and had extended her work on inclusive partnerships through her further involvement of teaching assistants and parents. What characterised her sustained success through her years in the school, then, was the combination of close attention to finding opportunities to develop individual, relational and organisational capacity; consultation and care; patience and persistence in the introduction and management of change processes; building and sustaining inclusive partnerships; high expectations for pupil and staff achievement; whole-school data systems to support this; being ahead of the game in terms of curriculum innovation; positive reinforcement of achievement; optimism; and the adoption and accumulation over time of combinations of context-sensitive leadership strategies.

Table 3.1 Key strategies in successful leadership

Key strategies	
Focus on improving standards in teaching and learning first, before addressing other aspects that need to change. In previous infant and nursery school, played a "hands-on" role in developing the teaching and learning policies and practices to improve standards	The challenge [when I started as the head of the infant and nursery school] was to actually try to focus in on what really mattered. And at that point, it was standards that mattered. And so now I'm doing the same here [at the new primary school] because the standards in the juniors are not good. So, it's focussing in on those standards
Introducing change in a careful way: embedding each change before introducing new ones, and consulting with staff	The other thing about managing, I think, is you introduce change and. kind of, embed it before you start doing too much other stuff If it's a new initiative, I don't think she goes into it and says, "Right, we're going to do this". She tends to have meetings first. She asks the staff what we think. (Teacher)
Aware of the different strengths that staff bring to the school: • Does not expect all staff to be the same • Builds on staff strengths in terms of strategic planning for the school and succession planning for the staff member	I've always said you should play to your strengths and I think sometimes we try and make people change [unnecessarily]. I'll give you an example, I know heads that won't have anyone shout at their children. Now I know on staff, I've got some that are much louder, they're just louder people I do see potential in people. Like, one of the TAs who we've just appointed who hasn't started yet… and I'm just convinced that that person is very talented
Distributes leadership: develops leadership roles to suit strengths and interests of staff, and needs of the school: • In the new primary, Jan has appointed a deputy (external appointment) who teaches in year 6, and who is focusing on raising standards, for this first year of the new primary school	The deputy was a deputy head of another school. So that was good. He had some experience and has been, I think, a really good appointment. He's leader of learning for upper school, and his role this year is to raise standards in Y6. So he's classroom based
School culture	
Challenge of amalgamating two school cultures into one. Previously, heavy emphasis upon discipline in the junior school. Jan wants to change the culture in KS2 (7–11-year-olds) to a warmer culture for the pupils (the kind of culture she had fostered in the previous infant and nursery school)	I think there's a very different culture in the juniors… The discipline, I think was much more severe. There wasn't that warmth

Table 3.1 (continued)

Key strategies Jan has used, and is using to develop a positive school culture include: • Developing new whole-school policies in the newly established primary school (as opposed to imposing policies formulated in infant and nursery school) • Treating non-teaching and teaching staff as one team. In previous infant and nursery school, Jan comments that it was hard to tell the difference between teachers and teaching assistants	There's lots to do and I'm very keen that…it's not kind of, "This is the way". It's not kind of a takeover by the infants. And I've had to make that clear all along the line. So, if you looked at our behaviour policy, it's a totally new one that we came up with, a reward system. And it has no relationship to the one which we had down in the infants or the one we had in the juniors. It's a new one I suspect you could go in (to Key Stage 1—previously the infant school) and you would not be able to tell in some cases who was the teacher and who was the teaching assistant. In some cases, we give teaching assistants quite important roles within the school Somebody this morning said, "I don't know who's a TA and who's a teacher?" Because we liaise so well together We're all treated as equals. I mean Jan, you can talk to her and I'm never made to think, "Oh, I'm only a TA and this is the head teacher". She would be really hurt if I think, she thought that was coming across or pupils thought that was coming across
Attributes	
Acts as a model to staff in how to relate to pupils	I act as a model all the time…In the infants, over the time, people knew what I was looking for and how I was with children. I don't think we should be rude to children. Yes, I think they need to have very clearly defined boundaries, and so, they need to know where they stand, routines and well organised classrooms. But you know, you have to take an interest in a child outside the classroom as well as what they're doing inside the classroom
Very high expectations of staff and pupils	She's got very high expectations of her staff and of the children, which I think is really good. It reflects on myself as then I have higher expectations of my children. (Teacher)
Analyses context very carefully. At times chooses to "ignore" issues that do not need urgent attention	I pick the issues to focus on so I choose to ignore some things. There's a lot at the moment that I'm choosing to ignore…if they are beyond my control, I am going to wait until the time is right There are some things about which she's adamant, "This is how it's going to be". But, then, there's other things that I know she wants to change. But that will take time and I think she knows that she can't just come in and say, "This is how it's going to be". (Teacher)

3.3 Organisational Learning, Changing Expectations and Increased Student Achievement

In relation to the role of leadership, a recent review of 11 research studies on the impact of PLCs on teaching practice and student learning is instructive. This reveals that:

> Although many of the 11 studies failed to describe specific changes in pedagogy, change in the professional culture of a school is a significant finding because it demonstrates that establishing a PLC contributes to a fundamental shift in the habits of mind that teachers bring to their daily work in the classroom. (Vescio et al. 2008, p. 84)

Changes in "habits of mind" caused by the actions of principals are present in many of the ISSPP case studies. Principals and others in their schools spoke of changing expectations for both the pedagogic performance of teachers as well as the resultant increased performance capabilities of their students. Importantly, these positive relationships between PLCs and gains in student achievement scores identified in eight of the case studies cited by Vescio et al. (2008) were found also in the ISSPP studies of schools in Australia, the USA and England.

> …a fundamental purpose for organizational learning is to enhance the school's capacity for self organization or self-design…, processes that seem likely to depend on double-loop and exploratory learning. Self-organization entails organizational members working together to restructure, reculture, and otherwise reorient themselves in response to new challenges without the need for external intervention. (Leithwood et al. 1998. In Mulford et al. 2004, p. 212)

3.3.1 Examples from the USA

The research team from the University at Buffalo (UB) studied seven successful principals of high need schools in the western part of New York State as part of the first phase of the ISSPP begun in 2001. Principals selected for inclusion in the study had to have led demonstrably successful student improvement initiatives—as revealed by increasing performance scores on required, standardized State tests, in schools deemed to be of "high need". To determine a school's level of need, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) has developed an index that is a ratio of student poverty (as measured by the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced lunch) plus the percentage of students with Limited English Proficiency, divided by the revenues available to that school. The higher the ratio, the greater the need, and six of the schools selected for the US study came from the highest quartile (one school was from a lower quartile and selected for comparative purposes).

In 2007, Giles reported on the leadership practices of a subset of three of the principals in these high need schools, particularly as they related to building their respective school's organisational learning capacity. He concluded that,

> In sum, the conditions necessary to facilitate organizational learning described in these US cases conform to those identified by Marks and Louis (1999), namely structure, shared

> commitment and collaborative activity, knowledge and skills, leadership, and feedback and accountability. (Giles 2007, pp. 36–37)

But no less important were Giles reflections on the work of these three principals in relation to the challenging conditions and contexts within which each worked,

> In all three of these challenging US schools, principals were transformational leaders whose approach to leadership recognized the limitations that time, organizational memory and lack of supportive conditions placed on collaborative capacity building (Stoll 1999). Setting direction, developing people and designing the organization were core elements of their practice, but in schools where order had or could easily break down, effective management of the learning environment was a crucial first step in winning the support of teachers and parents. The setting of direction also looked very different from the extended vision-making process advocated in some popular leadership texts (see Senge 2000). The issues facing challenging schools are too complex and immediate for there to be sufficient time to engage in extended vision-making exercises. (Giles 2007, p. 36)

The challenge of having sufficient time to promote organisational learning; to change existing expectations, such as perceived limitations about what schools and children in high-poverty communities can accomplish, and, ultimately, to increase student achievement, is of tremendous importance. The principals we studied were all successful in building the capacity necessary to meet short-term, externally imposed goals, such as the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets established by federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability legislation and the accompanying student achievement standards utilized in New York. But what is not apparent from these cases was whether these leaders had helped their respective schools develop the capacity to self-renew over the long-term, and how they worked to achieve freedom from the "tyranny of the urgent".

Consequently, in 2008, ISSPP teams went back to some of their original case sites to determine what had transpired in the intervening years. Ostensibly an examination of organisational sustainability, this third phase of the ISSPP study (the first phase was the aforementioned case studies and the second a survey) provided insights into what was possible when additional time was taken into consideration. Methodologically, this was done through the use of a subsequent time sample and a research protocol only slightly modified from the earlier study (Day 2005). Of the seven principals originally reported on by the UB team (Jacobson et al. 2005), four had retired and one had taken a central office position. And, of the two remaining principals—both of whom were still at the same school, only one had clearly managed to sustain school success. Therefore, in 2008 the team returned to Fraser Academy, now Fraser Community Charter School (FCCS), to ascertain how this one school leader had managed to sustain success over time with particular attention paid to self-renewing organisational learning.

Now in her 15th year as principal at Fraser (she was hired in 1994), this African American woman, with more than 30 years experience as an educator, has led the transformation of her school from being one of worst in terms of student academic achievement in New York State's second largest school district, to being one of its best. We have reported at length in the past about her efforts during the first decade of her tenure to change the low expectations held by her faculty, her students, their parents, and of the larger school community as well, about the ability of these

youngsters to perform well academically (Giles et al. 2005; Jacobson et al. 2007), but only more recently about the efforts undertaken at the school to enable organisational learning and capacity building to self-renew (Jacobson et al. 2009).

Using the same conceptual framework employed in the earlier study, i.e. Leithwood's and Riehl's (2005) core leadership practices of setting directions, developing people and redesigning the organisation, as well as the enabling principles of accountability, caring and learning (Giles et al. 2005; Jacobson et al. 2005), we found that this principal had, over the intervening years, continued to hold everyone accountable for children learning at mastery levels while maintaining a caring and nurturing school environment (thus remaining faithful to the direction she had set when she first arrived). But holding steadfast to the original direction necessitated redesigning the organisation in order to sustain the continued development and capacity of the staff, students and their parents around the principle of learning. Specifically, Fraser was converted from being a traditional public school working under the direct control of the school district to a district charter school which, though still technically under the control of the district, provided FCCS fiscal autonomy that enabled greater discretion on spending for professional development, as well as human resource flexibility that released the school from hiring constraints, such as the district's residency requirement and seniority transfer rights.

As Giles (2007) noted, these core practices of redesigning the organisation and developing people are very closely interconnected and it is at their interface that a principal can simultaneously exert pressure and support to enable capacity building and organisational learning. By converting to a charter school governance structure, Fraser was able to sustain its productivity through the maintenance of the formal and informal structures that were created prior to charter conversion and by the concerted efforts of the principal and collective action of her faculty. These formal and informal structures included grade-level and departmental planning teams, faculty meetings, on-going professional development, teacher mentoring and an active parent–teacher association. Meanwhile, the principal continued to focus pressure and support on the school's technical core, i.e. the improvement of instruction and student achievement, in order to realize the high expectations for student performance that is at the heart of her direction for the school. But it was the collective action of her faculty in response to the major deleterious consequence to conversion charter—the loss of about 25% of the veteran teachers over 4 years; teachers who feared they would lose a measure of job security if they stayed at the school—that is at the heart of this story of self-renewal and changing expectations. The principal succinctly described the problem and her response to it,

> I would say each year we may have to hire four new staff. That forced us to set up a system in which we immediately immerse them in our programs, our reading and writing programs so that they can learn it, and we pair them with a master teacher and a mentor and just do whatever is necessary to get them up to speed right away.

The principal and her remaining veteran teachers recognized the need to help the new replacement teachers get on board quickly. This meant faculty working together through peer coaching in the classrooms, with peer study groups becoming

the primary vehicle by which these new teachers were brought into the literacy program. Grade-level teams began meeting on a more regular basis with veterans modelling a lesson and then the team discussed what they saw, what worked, what needed to be improved. For the new teachers, these interactions helped them quickly overcome fears of "letting the principal, fellow teachers and the children down". The teachers we interviewed who came to Fraser after the conversion to a charter school talked at length about the staff development and peer support they received. Consider, for example, the following teacher's description of her first year of teaching at the school,

> I remember being overwhelmed and [the principal] put me in touch with the literacy consultants. The great thing about Fraser is that any teacher who feels unequipped will be given support immediately. If you keep quiet about it, then they won't be able to help, but your results will show and then they will recommend that you attend workshops and that you work with a mentor teacher. I never felt like [the principal] and the other teachers were unapproachable.

In addition to formal and informal staff development and peer support, the principal addressed the problem of staff change through the creation of explicit curriculum maps at each grade level. These curriculum maps were like road maps, providing new teachers with directions and guidelines for the skills and strategies needed to help children meet New York State standards in time for the annual assessments. As the reading specialized explained, "We decided we would need to treat all teachers like reading staff. Because we had to think about the tests, we also met with each grade level and actually mapped out what was going to be taught to get the kids ready for the assessments. That was generated from [the principal]."

Veteran and new teachers alike commented about how much they learned from developing and utilizing these curriculum maps. "The maps really helped all of us keep on target", noted one veteran teacher. "As part of the modelling and peer coaching discussions in our grade level meetings, we would look at our maps together to see where we could all improve to help kids meet their targets." One new teacher added, "It is really impressive how much the principal know about teaching."

While veteran teachers acknowledged the pressure of sustaining the success of the program, they also felt empowered by their leadership roles, "By allowing me to share strategies that worked, I felt empowered that I could be a leader…it gave me a glimpse of what I could become." Another noted, "It was hard in some ways, but I have to say I felt really good about taking a leadership role in keeping the program moving forward in spite of all the staff changes." In fact, teacher leadership has become further institutionalized (and self-renewing) over the past 5 years with the formation of a school-wide leadership team that meets at least twice a month to coordinate the school's staff development activities. This school-wide team has a teacher representative from each grade level and is now at the heart of the Fraser's ability to sustain its success.

The necessity of responding to the urgent circumstances caused by converting to a charter school accelerated the emergence of a collaborative and professional learning environment at Fraser. Obviously adaptive in nature, these responses have helped to ensure sufficient stability for generative, self-renewing and sustained or-

ganisational learning and capacity building to occur at the school. In other words, the sustained success at FCCS can be seen as the on-going interplay between an effort to create a governance structure that attempts to maximize faculty quality and commitment through the use of capacity-building supports that reward organisational learning and development through personal and collective self-renewal and professional growth.

Redesigning the organisation and developing people are closely interconnected ambitions and at the interface of these practices that principals exerted pressure and support (Fullan 1991) to facilitate capacity building through organisational learning (Youngs and King 2002). Principals grow the capacity of their schools by sustaining a productive interface between structure and agency. This web of collaborative interactions was enabled by formal and informal structures and the concerted action of the principal. Formal structures involved responses to state and district accountability mandates including School-Based Decision-Making teams, district and school site planning teams, mentoring, teacher evaluations, common planning time teams, faculty meetings, professional development and active parent–teacher associations. Less formal opportunities seemed to be more prevalent and double-loop learning occurred within temporary structures such as cross-grade or cross-department task forces. Sometimes these would be date-driven, at other times driven by new learning obtained from professional development or reading.

In challenging schools previously successful professional strategies are often derailed by reductions in resources, state mandates and even district policies. By necessity collaborative learning in such urgent circumstances tended to be adaptive in nature—trying to ensure sufficient stability for generative organisational learning to occur elsewhere in the school.

The conditions necessary to facilitate organisational learning described in the US cases conform to those identified by Marks and Louis (1999), namely structure, shared commitment and collaborative activity, knowledge and skills, leadership, and feedback and accountability. For these principals, schools, organisational learning was both person and task-centred. The business of achieving the task (the measurable test result), whilst important, did not drown the business of caring for the students as persons and, within this, their broader well-being. Indeed, their leadership demonstrates Elmore's adage that measurable achievement gains inevitably lag behind gains in quality. In these schools, teachers were not merely "service providers" who "delivered" the curriculum:

> Schools that seek to define their teachers as "service providers"…whose job it is to promote the needs and values of the institution have overlooked the personal and individual nature of teachers' work… (O'Connor 2008, p. 126)

Organisational learning (OL) is the collaborative building of personal, interpersonal and organisational capacity through self-renewal (Leithwood and Louis 1998a; Louis et al. 1996; Silins et al. 2002). OL has become closely aligned with a form of transformational leadership developed from the extensive empirical work of Leithwood who, with Riehl, has identified setting direction, developing people and redesigning the organisation as the core leadership practices necessary but insufficient to facilitate OL, regardless of context**.**

Capacity building emerged from the single- and double-loop learning of "the interplay among personal abilities, interpersonal relationships, and organizational structures" (Mitchell and Sackney 2000, p. 11). Single-loop learning occurred within existing structural arrangements, while double-loop learning, which is more complex and time-consuming, generates new learning by examining the root causes and basic assumptions of existing professional attitudes and behaviours (Senge 2000). Moreover, professional learning communities are dependent upon supportive internal (Marks and Louis 1999) and external (Bryk et al. 1999; Marks and Printy 2003; Stoll 1999) conditions, and are characterized by "shared norms and values, a focus on student learning, reflective dialogue, de-privatization of practice, and collaboration" (Louis and Kruse 1995, p. 140).

3.4 Discussion and Conclusions

Across our cases, the principals studied recognized the limitations that time, organisational memory and lack of supportive conditions placed on collaborative capacity building (Stoll 1999) and the possibilities for growth and further achievement which new, higher expectations, experience of "distributed" and "layered" leadership promised. Setting direction, developing people and designing the organisation were core elements of their practice, but in schools where order could easily break down, effective management of the learning environment was a crucial first step in winning the support of teachers and parents. The issues facing challenging schools are too complex and immediate for sufficient time to engage in extended vision-making exercises. Vision making in these schools is a necessary but insufficient condition for the early-accelerated growth which schools at risk of failure, in particular, need to begin on the road to success.

In terms of Stacey's (1993) account of management in the context of complexity theory, these heads in challenging schools engaged in both "ordinary" management, "required in order to carry out day-to-day problem solving to achieve the organisation's established objectives" (Rosenhead 1998, p. 6) and "extraordinary" management, that which is, "required if the organisation is to be able to transform itself in situations of open-ended change" (op cit, p. 6).

> Here rationalistic forms of decision-making are largely inoperative, since these require as their starting point precisely those "givens" which must now be disputed. (op cit, p. 6)

Exercising extraordinary management requires the abilities to be analytical, reflective, intuitive, innovatory, creative and flexible and their interventions to be timely, progressive and context-sensitive. Moreover, it requires a keen understanding of others, the dynamics of group discussion and disputation and emotional understanding—an ability to understand the qualitative patterns of thought, emotion and behaviour that their leadership interventions provoke as an essential part of their progressive promotion and management. This suggests that "ambition" and "vision" must be accompanied by diagnostic abilities, strategic intelligence, operational

know how, reflexivity and emotional understanding—terms which represent more accurately the core features and complexities of successful leaders work.

References

Ärlestig, H. (2008). *Communication between principals and teachers in successful schools*. doktorsavhandling, pedagogiska institutionen, Umeå universitet.

Björkman, C. (2008). *Internal capacities for school improvement—Principals' views in Swedish secondary schools.* doktorsavhandling, pedagogiska institutionen, Umeå universitet.

Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Stoll, L., Thomas, S., & Wallace, M. (2005). *Creating and sustaining professional learning communities* (Research Report No. 637). London: General Teaching Council for England/Department for Education and Skills.

Bryk, A., Camburn, E., & Louis, K. S. (1999). Professional community in Chicago elementary schools: Facilitating factors and organizational consequences. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(Suppl.), 751–781.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). *Trust in schools: A core resource for school improvement.* New York: Sage.

Day, C. (2005). Sustaining success in challenging contexts: Leadership in English schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 573–583.

Day, C., Stobart, G., Sammons, P., Kington, A., & Gu, Q. (2007). *Teachers matter: Connecting variations in teachers' work, lives and effectiveness.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Dufour, R. (2004). What is a "Professional Learning Community"? *Educational Leadership, 6*(8), 6.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2003). *Learning to lead change: Building system capacity.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Giles, C. (2007). Building capacity in challenging US schools: An exploration of transformational leadership practice in relation to organizational learning. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 30–38.

Giles, C., Johnson, L., Brooks, S., & Jacobson, S. L. (2005). Building bridges, building community: Transformational leadership in a challenging urban context. *Journal of School Leadership, 15*(5), 519–545.

Höög, J., & Johansson, O. (red). (2009). *Struktur, kultur, ledarskap – Förutsättningar för framgångsrika skolor?* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Jacobson, S., Johnson, L., Ylimaki, R., & Giles, C. (2005). Successful school leadership in changing times: Cross national findings in the third year of an international research project. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 607–618.

Jacobson, S., Brooks, S., Giles, C., Johnson, L., & Ylimaki, R. (2007). Successful leadership in three high poverty urban elementary schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(4), 1–27.

Jacobson, S., Johnson, L., Ylimaki, R., & Giles, C. (2009). Successful school principals: Five years later. *Journal of Educational Administration, 47*(6), 753–764.

Leithwood, K., & Louis, K. S. (Eds.). (1998a). *Organizational learning in schools.* Downington: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Leithwood, K., & Louis, K. (Eds.). (1998b). *Educational leadership for organizational learning and improved student outcomes*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2005). What do we already know about educational leadership? In W. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.) *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 12–27). New York: Teachers College Press.

Leithwood, K., Leonard, L., & Sharratt, L. (1998). Conditions fostering organizational learning in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34*(2), 243–276.

Leithwood, K., Mascall, B., & Strauss, T. (2007). Distributing leadership to make schools smarter: Taking the ego out of the system. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 35*(3), 261–288.

Louis, K. (2007). Trust and improvement in schools. *Journal of Educational Change, 6*(1), 1–24.
Louis, K. S., & Kruse, S. D. (1995). *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.
Louis, K. S., & Marks, H. M. (1998). Does professional learning community affect the classroom? Teachers' work and student experiences in restructuring schools. *American Journal of Education, 10*(4), 532–575.
Louis, K. S., Marks, H. M., & Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 33*(4), 757–798.
Marks, H. M., & Louis, K. S. (1999). Teacher empowerment and the capacity for organizational learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(Suppl.), 707–750.
Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(3), 370–397.
Mitchell, C., & Sackney, L. (2000). *Profound improvement: Building capacity for a learning community.* Downington: Swets & Zeitlinger.
Mulford, W., Silins, H., & Leithwood, K. (2004). *Educational leadership for organizational learning and improved student outcomes.* Boston: Kluwer.
Newmann, F. M., et al. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
O'Connor, K. E. (2008). "You choose to care" teachers, emotions and professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(1), 117–126.
Robinson, V. M. J. (2007). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why.* Australian Council for Educational Leaders, Monograph 41; ACFL Inc. PO Box 4368, Winmalee, NSW Australia.
Rosenhead, J. (1998). Complexity theory and management practice. Operational research working papers, LSEOR 98.25. Department of Operational Research, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK.
Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday Currency.
Senge, P. M. (2000). *Schools that learn*. New York: Doubleday.
Silins, H. C., Mulford, W. R., & Zarins, S. (2002). Organizational learning and school change. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(5), 613–642.
Stacey, R. (1993). *Strategic management and organisational dynamics.* London: Pitman.
Stoll, L. (1999). Realizing our potential: Understanding and developing capacity for lasting improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10*(4), 503–532.
Törnsén, M. (2009). *Successful principal leadership: Prerequsites, processes and outcomes*. doktorsavhandling, pedagogiska institutionen, Umeå universitet.
Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(1), 80–91.
Weick, K. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.
Youngs, P., & King, M. B. (2002) Principal leadership for professional development to build school capacity. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(5), 643–670.

Chapter 4
Democratic Instructional Leadership in Australia, Denmark, and the United States

Rose M. Ylimaki, David Gurr, Lejf Moos, Kasper Kofod and Lawrie Drysdale

This chapter examines how principals in the United States and their counterparts in Australia and Denmark enact and, at times, struggle to sustain democratic ideals amidst current neoliberal and neoconservative pressures to improve student outcomes. Since the beginning of the 1990s, and with renewed pace from the beginning of the twenty-first century, the US, Danish, and Australian educational systems have been undergoing a process of thorough transformation under the influence of strong international, neo-liberal discourses that have linked education to economic prosperity, and to neo-conservative trends such as back-to-basics, subject-oriented teaching, and testing programs. At the same time there are other pressures that emphasize personalization of learning, team approaches to teaching, and the pervasive use of information and communication technologies. The meaning of terms such as leadership, professionals, and learning are thus under profound change (Moos et al. 2007; Moos 2003; Ylimaki and McClain 2009).

More specifically, in all three countries, schools now operate in a context of increased accountability and public visibility as a result of various national curriculum and testing policies as well as organizational reforms. In the United States, for example, the federal No Child Left Behind Act (2002) and related testing mandates require that students in grades three through eight must be tested annually in each state, and each school must demonstrate adequate yearly progress towards the goal of 100% proficiency (on state-administered standardized tests) by the year 2014. Further, these policies appear to support more conservative, back-to-basics curriculum ideology. And as some scholars (e.g. Apple 2004) have documented, these recent US federal policies (e.g. No Child Left Behind Act 2002; Put Reading First Act 2002) have changed (for the better or worse) the content of curriculum, discourse around curriculum, the pace if not the pedagogy of instruction, and the allocation of time and personnel. Further, US schools are subject to forces of neoliberal policy as evidenced by the popularity of school choice and voucher programs that provide

R. M. Ylimaki (✉)
University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA
e-mail: rylimaki@email.arizona.edu

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5_4,

public funds to private schools and, in the process, require schools to compete for students/"customers".

In the Danish context, an example of neoliberal policy is that the responsibility for finances and administration of the "Folkeskole" (primary and lower secondary school, students aged 6–16) was in 1992 devolved to municipalities and from there to schools. Thus, the Danish school leader now manages very large parts of the budget in collaboration with School Boards, which have a parental majority membership. The Acts, and, therefore, the responsibility for objectives of the schools, remain in the hands of Parliament/the Ministry of Education but the interpretations and administration of the curriculum was given to municipalities and to schools themselves. Similarly, since the mid 1990s, many US states and school districts have mandated some form of self-management. Although specific mandates vary by state and school district in the United States, principals are expected to make decisions with a governance council composed of parents, teachers' union members, and sometimes community members and students.

Organizational devolution and decentralization has been a prominent feature of Australian education over the past two decades as well. Victoria (the second largest school system) was a forerunner in the development of self-management in schools in Australia and one of the first states to initiate and implement self-managed schools internationally. The 1980s and 1990s witnessed continuous and radical change in the Victorian government school system, culminating in the Schools of the Future program in 1993 which introduced large-scale reorganization and the decentralization of numerous functions central to schools, including local selection of staff, control over the school budget, the articulation of school goals in a school charter and the design of a framework for accountability. By 1997, self-management had been extended to all schools and the Victorian system was regarded as one of the most far-reaching examples of this anywhere in the world (Caldwell et al. 1997). Currently, there is agreement at the state and federal levels for the public reporting of school performance data including student learning outcomes, and opinion data (Pike 2009).

In all three countries, these simultaneous pressures for decentralization/organizational reforms and increased student outcomes in literacy and numeracy along with policies that support back-to-basics curricula, have raised concerns about authentic participation, democratic education for the common good, and the breadth and authenticity of curriculum work. These concerns are illuminated by an examination of democratic leadership. While conceptions of democracy vary across Scandinavia and the colonized United States and Australia, a cross-national analysis of cases indicated similar tensions and dilemmas in how principals enact and sustain democratic leadership in the current political and economic context, particularly related to underlying school ideals and values, participation in decision-making, and authentic curriculum work.

4.1 Theoretical Framework: Democratic Instructional Leadership

At the base of democratic leadership rests a sense of what it is to be human, a deep respect for cultivation of the common good and the need to act according to one's own direction. We find it interesting to look at the democratic possibilities for instructional leaders, first and foremost, because we find that there are clear links and connections between the conditions that educators have and the conditions and frames that schools and educators give students (Moos 2008). This kind of leadership is not only a matter of knowing about democracy, it is more a matter of acquiring democratic patterns of interpretation and ways of life (Beane and Apple 1999; Dewey 1916). A democratic leader must, therefore, include the possibilities to test those interpretations and ways of living in real life beyond prescriptive decision-making programs, back-to-basics curriculum, and standardized tests.

Instructional leadership literature contains numerous references to "democratic" leadership that are most often anchored in leadership concepts stressing the need for school leaders to cultivate the common good, foster authentic participation and teacher empowerment, and know the individual learning needs to act according to one's own direction. (e.g. Blasé et al. 1995; Gale and Densmore 2003; Lambert 1998). More specifically, democratic leadership aims to create an environment in which people are encouraged and supported in aspiring to truths about the world both in organizational structures and in curriculum practices (Woods 2005, p. xvi). Although definitions of democratic leadership vary somewhat generally and within each national context and instructional leadership literature generally, the model of leadership is generally concerned with: (1) creating and sustaining democratic ideals and growth (2) cultivating authentic and equitable participation; and (3) supporting the use of authentic pedagogy and curriculum. Each of these categories is further explored below.

4.1.1 Fostering Democratic Ideals and Growth

Democratic leadership contributes to leaders' and others' growth towards human potential (Woods 2005). For example, Barth (2001) proposes that teacher leaders might be sustained in their efforts to co-lead the accomplishment of school expectations when their creative powers are enlisted and supported, when they are trusted, empowered, included, protected, share in responsibility for failure, and are given credit for success. He states, "When teachers grow as co-leaders, principals extend their own leadership capacity, students enjoy a community of learners and schools benefit from better decisions" (p. 445). Democracy and democratic leadership are about who we are as social human beings, continually engaging in creative social action, influenced by and influencing others. This is what the developmental conception of democracy is most essentially about. Its centre of gravity is the flowering of the person—his or

her positive attributes, capabilities, and unfolding human potential in a social order in which they are actively and self-consciously engaged (Woods 2005, p. 17).

4.1.2 Cultivating Authentic and Equitable Participation

In 1916 John Dewey wrote, "A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic" (p. 99). Democratic leadership in this sense directs participative educational activity towards the deepest curricular questions and purposes of creative human potential. The breadth of authentic and equitable participation serves to create an environment in which people are encouraged and supported in aspiring to the truths about the world. Further, democratic leadership promotes respect for diversity and reduces cultural and material inequalities (social justice).

Likewise, Gale and Densmore (2003) stated that "a democratic stance towards participation and decision-making involves establishing conditions that foreground: respectful relationships, associations, consideration, reflexivity, consultation, empathy and active cooperation and community mobilization" (p. 132). Leadership within authentic, democratic participation is most often described as a manifestation of democratic processes rather than the personal status associated with a formal administrative position. If instructional leadership, then, is perceived as a manifestation of the democratic process, Lambert (1998) defines it thus:

> The key notion in this definition is that leadership is about learning together, and constructing meaning and knowledge collectively and collaboratively. It involves opportunities to surface and mediate perceptions, values, beliefs, information, and assumptions through continuing conversations; to inquire about and generate ideas together; to seek to reflect upon and make sense of work in the light of shared beliefs and new information; and to create actions that grow out of these new understandings. Such is the core of leadership. (pp. 5–6)

Blasé et al. (1995, p. 35) also point out that democratic leaders 'build supportive environments of trust and involvement in which everyone challenges current policies and procedures by asking "*for whom*" and "*why*". In the current global era of accountability and neoliberal discourse, the principal's challenge is to fulfil current policy requirements for decentralization and organizational reform and at the same time to sustain authentic and democratic participation and take care of the comprehensive vision of "Democratic Bildung" (Moos et al. 2007).

4.1.3 Implementing Authentic Pedagogy and Curriculum

Democratic leadership infuses the life of the school as an educational community with active, participative learning and authentic pedagogies. A view of authentic

pedagogy describes it as an approach which values explanation to students; involves assessment of student work by a parent, teacher, and fellow students; includes plenary sessions where students could present and comment on work; has a homework planner and one homework assignment in which the student taught part of a module to a parent (Airey et al. 2004, p. 10). In other words, democratic leadership theories posit that students in schools know a good deal about learning, about the conditions that encourage it, and the conditions that inhibit it (Flecknoe 2004). Glickman et al. (2009) also remind us that a democratic model of teaching encompasses more than specific techniques:

> Democratic pedagogy aims for freedom of experience, pursuit of truth in the marketplace of ideas, individual and group choices, student activity, participation, associative learning, application, demonstration, and contribution of learning to immediate and larger communities. Such pedagogical effort is undertaken in the context of equality for all, consideration of individual liberty and group freedom, and respect for the authority and responsibility of the teacher to set conditions for developmental learning. (p. 281)

And Woods (2005) argues that democratic pedagogy needs to be fashioned in such a way that recognizes and addresses the different aspects of inequality. He specifies three aspects of inequality that are relevant for democratic pedagogy. First, there are distributive injustices, which obtrude into the processes of learning, such as differential access to material and informational resources. Second, there are cultural injustices that characterize society and cross into the school, such as cultural, class, gender, and ethnic inequalities and histories of injustice. Third, there is a hierarchy of authority and status within the school-as-community. The implications of considering this and how it may be diminished, if not eliminated, can be discomforting and may begin to challenge existing differences and hierarchies; the principal is *an* authority, not *the* authority in the school; the teacher is *an* authority, not *the* authority in the classroom.

At the heart of democratic pedagogy is an open approach to knowledge. This involves creative application in practical action, dialogue and sharing of views, expertise and information amongst networks of learners, and constructivist learning that encourages students to construct new knowledge through the use of complex reasoning skills. Findings from research (e.g. Allington 2002; Shannon 2001) also showed that with democratic teaching and authentic pedagogy: (1) students generally felt better and more positive and had a greater sense of responsibility for their own learning and (2) whilst there was no common experiencing of more attainment, students who were successfully encouraged to take control of their own learning did achieve more. Internal alignment of leadership approaches within a school is critical (Woods 2005). Democratic pedagogy and practice envelop both students and staff in a school to be a community seriously committed to a breadth of meaningful learning. The distributed leadership of the principal and teacher leaders involves the attempt to put into practice the same ideals of democracy and authentic, democratic pedagogy. In the next section, we provide example cases of successful school principals in Australia, the United States, and Denmark and describe how the principals worked through the tensions and dilemmas of democratic leadership in the current political context.

4.2 Overview of Cases from Successful Schools in Australia, the United States, and Denmark

The cases used in this chapter were chosen not only to illustrate similarities and differences amongst democratic instructional leaders in each context but also the tensions and struggles of principals to democratic instructional leadership while they are under pressures to adopt structured organizational reforms and narrow curriculum around basic literacy and math skills tested on assessments in each state/country. In the following sections, we discuss cases from each national context, highlighting relevant values, beliefs, and leadership practices that study participants associated with affective, democratic school success and improved student outcomes. We then provide a cross-national comparison of how successful school leaders address democratic ideals and growth, authentic and equitable participation, authentic pedagogy and curriculum and yet meet their respective pressures for accountability.

4.2.1 Australian Cases

The Australian cases feature principals of two primary schools (Bellfield and South Morang) and one secondary school (Brentwoood), located in urban, semi-rural, and suburban areas respectively of the large city of Melbourne, Victoria. Women principals (white) lead two of the school cases and the remaining principal is a white male. The cases were further selected to exemplify a range and balance of democratic instructional leadership practices that contribute to a broad understanding of success (improved student outcomes and education of the whole child) in the schools.

4.2.1.1 Jan Shrimption, South Morang Primary School

Prior to Jan's appointment in late 1999, the school had experienced a considerable decline in performance, especially between 1995 and 1999. Jan was appointed to help the school improve and she did this to the extent that the school was identified as a turn-around school as a result of a systemic school review conducted in 2003 (each Victorian government school is currently required to undergo self-assessment and independent verification every 4 years, and previously every 3 years; see Gurr et al. 2005). Notable improvements included Mathematics and English learning outcomes, staff opinion, parent opinion, resource management, and school image. We initially studied this school in 2004 and returned in 2008 when we also conducted observations of her work. The school has maintained its level of success and the following provides a summary of the key reasons for this sustained success.

Over the 10 years as principal at the school, Jan's philosophy remained the same. She felt it was important to work holistically. For example, while literacy and numeracy were important, so were the Arts, social competency, and tolerance of others. Her aim was to bring together the resources to create a community of life-long learners, rather than striving to be the top school in the state. Jan strongly believed that schools were for kids and this was demonstrated by her recruitment philosophy.

4.2.1.2 Principal John Fleming: Bellfield Primary School and Haileybury College

John Fleming became the assistant principal (1992) and then principal (1996) of Bellfield Primary School from 1992 to 2005, and from 2006 onward, the head of the K-10 Berwick campus of Haileybury College (2006). Bellfield is a small (220-student), government school in a high-poverty suburb of Melbourne, whilst Haileybury College is a large (more than 2500-student), high-fee, independent school in Melbourne. The contrast between these two schools is dramatic. Yet, and this is perhaps the central feature of John's work as a principal, his passion, purpose, mission and fundamental views about education remain the same—to ensure that the children are provided with an environment in which they can do their best.

John is different from most principals in that he can demonstrate direct influence on the quality of instructional, curriculum and assessment, and student learning. John knew early in his career that he wanted to be a principal because he is passionate and driven in his quest to make a difference to the lives of children, and being principal gives him the most influence on what happens in a school.

4.2.1.3 Vicki Forbes: Brentwood Secondary College

Vicki Forbes was appointed as principal of Brentwood Secondary College in 2000 after having been an assistant principal for 5 years in a high-profile "successful" school that enjoyed a reputation in the community for academic excellence. Brentwood Secondary College is a co-educational, single campus school established in 1969 in a residential eastern suburb of Melbourne. By the mid 1990s the reputation of the school had declined in comparison with other high-profile schools in the area. Student enrolment increased from 700 to 800 when Vicki became principal in the year 2000. Whilst the reputation of the school had improved, Vicki believed that the school was underperforming and she set about improving the school's performance in a number of areas, particularly student achievement.

Under Vicki's leadership school enrolments have continued to increase (currently 1350 in 2007), student achievement in English and mathematics in years 7 to 10, and performance across most study areas at year 12 has continued to improve and is well above state and like school benchmarks (based on socio-economic and

English language background status). The school is now regarded as one of the top performing government schools in the state. Much of the success was attributable to Vicki's role as an educational leader.

Most of Vicki's impact on student outcomes has been indirect, focusing considerable energy into attracting, retaining and developing staff, promoting shared leadership and decision-making, developing personal and professional capacity of staff through a focus on improving teaching and learning, and building relationships. It is in this last aspect that she has a direct impact on students as she directly influences their values and beliefs about school, which leads to improvements in learning outcomes.

4.2.2 US Cases

4.2.2.1 Hamilton Elementary

Hamilton Elementary is located in a poor neighbourhood of an urban area. In general, interviewees paint a picture of Hamilton being a school recovering from recent past failures—failures that ultimately resulted in the school's designation as under registration review by the state. After 4 years, Hamilton is now perceived as an improving school, with rising student assessment scores and reputation in the city. The principal is an African American female in her early fifties. In 2000, she arrived at Hamilton in what would be her first principalship of a school that had just been placed under registration review (SURR status) because only 12% of fourth graders and none of the eighth graders achieved mastery on the state English Language Arts test and only 6% of eighth graders achieved mastery on the state test.

The new principal had a limited curriculum background, but she had a fierce determination to make a difference and a strong internship experience with the Fraser principal (described later) to guide her early efforts. She also had a calm manner and excellent counselling skills that served her well in restoring order and security to a chaotic school environment. As she put it, "Most of all, I wanted to empower children and parents in this neighbourhood school community. But when I started, I knew I had to establish order and then I could deal with curriculum and organizational changes like [Fraser principal]." In light of current accountability mandates (and designation as a SURR school—School Under Regents' Review), the principal committed the school to the idea that measurable learning would be the central mission of the school because, as she tells everyone, "Everything leads back to student achievement. We need to raise our test scores for the state, but beyond that, children are marginalized in life if they do not have strong academic backgrounds." In order to accomplish these goals, she wrote grants and eventually garnered the money to attend workshops devoted to achievement gap analysis.

4.2.2.2 Costello Elementary

Costello is located in another urban area with schools located in the midst of social and economic conditions similar to those of Hamilton. Costello is the largest elementary school in the district with a very diverse student population, a negative reputation in the community, and long-standing problem with union/management relations. When the Costello principal began her tenure, she encountered similar safety and discipline problems to those of Hamilton, and she characterized the school culture as "disrespectful and very teacher-centered". In the first few months, she worked strictly on securing the building and gaining control of student discipline. She also communicated a strong conviction that all children deserve can learn, and they deserve respect. As one teacher put it, "She instilled discipline with respect and brought structure and order to the school." These teachers and other interviewees were also quick to point out that the Costello principal's "take charge" attitude often offended teachers and parents".

The Costello principal did not have a strong curriculum background, but she knew the school was failing many children. She studied several pre-packaged literacy programs that had been successful in other urban schools and happened upon America's Choice. America's Choice is a standardized, scripted program, but one that is grounded in research on authentic literacy instruction and uses many authentic materials (e.g. novels). Further, America's Choice requires 80% staff acceptance of the program, a collaborative step this directive, authoritarian principal may not have taken on her own. The principal sent several veteran teachers to explore the program and bring their impressions back to the faculty. The teachers came back with an enthusiastic endorsement of the program and piloted the program in order to have evidence that it worked at Costello—evidence they eventually used to "sell" America's Choice to the other teachers.

4.2.2.3 Fraser Academy

Fraser Academy is a K-8 school located in a high-poverty neighbourhood of an urban centre. The principal is an African American female in her late fiftiess with a reputation for "turning around a failing school" in another urban setting. Since the beginning of the principal's tenure, Fraser school has risen from being one of the lowest performing schools in its district to one of the highest. Although this principal faced an enormous task of changing teacher expectations and turning around a failing urban school, she had additional resources from a local bank that sponsored the school improvement process (Giles et al. 2005).

In contrast to the Hamilton and Costello principals, the Fraser principal had a strong curriculum background and knew first-hand the power of authentic literacy instruction for struggling learners. Early in her tenure, the principal sent several teachers for training at the Teachers' College Reading and Writing Project whereby teachers gained theoretical understandings of the reading and writing

process and then used those understandings to inform their teaching. The Teachers College Project is grounded in a philosophy of authentic literacy acquisition. Students read authentic literature and primary sources and often write about topics of their own choice. At the TC Literacy Project training sessions, teachers also learned to integrate literacy throughout the academic and humanities curricula in authentic ways.

4.2.2.4 Colman Elementary

Colman Elementary School (K-5) is located in Sagamore, a first-ring suburb of a large Western New York urban district and has an enrolment of 513 students. The teaching faculty of the school is entirely white and female, and many have spent the majority of their teaching careers at the school. Like many first-ring suburbs adjacent to US cities, Sagamore has become more racially, socially, and economically diverse in recent years, and longtime teachers from Colman note changing family structures in the school. Yet, students at Colman Elementary have consistently outperformed students from schools with similar demographics) on standardized assessments over the past several years.

The principal, Mary Romano, is a White female in her late fifties with previous experience in urban, high-poverty schools, a caring, democratic leadership style and strong pedagogical knowledge. Although she did not face the security challenges and achievement problems of Fraser and her previous schools, she was greeted with apprehension by the veteran teachers at Colman because she was from outside the district and an "unknown". She also notes that when she arrived, the school was "extremely traditional, teacher-centered, and the staff lacked cohesion and a sense of community" She also recognized, "In order to maintain high academic performance in the midst of changing demographics, we needed to become more student-centered."

4.2.3 Danish Cases

4.2.3.1 Principal Annie Andersen: West School

The West School is a Danish Folkschool, primary and lower secondary, with students aged 6–16: There were 440 students and 36 teachers. The school is situated in a working class and lower middle-class community on the outskirts of Copenhagen. In 2001, the principal had been acting as a principal for 2 years. Although the community with the West School has not been merged, it is undergoing restructurings. In 2009, the West School is going to be merged with another school as part of what is called a local adjustment of school structure to parents moving round.

4.2.3.2 Principal Bent Bertelsen: North School

The Danish North School, also a Folkschool, is situated in an affluent area north of Copenhagen. It had 630 students and 65 teachers. The principal, Bent Bertelsen, believed that more bureaucracy and test demands leave less room for broad competencies because all subjects are test-subjects in the last grades: a focus on tests brings a focus on skills. This narrowing of work in the older grades resulted in teacher stress. The school leadership brought the external demands to the teachers saying:

> Let's see how we can use this in a productive way. Can national tests and student plans be used to legitimize the school to parents? Can we couple the new plans with what we used to do: the student portfolio? Tests are mostly rituals and the results are difficult to use for educational purposes.

Danish schools write development plans, now called Quality Reports, for the municipality every year. Says the principal:

> My task is to translate them to teachers so the plans can be turned into developmental activities, in order to give meaning to teachers. It is about me trusting teachers.

The principal used the same phrase as the principal of the West School: They have to translate the external demands to teachers in order to have them accept and implement the demands.

4.2.3.3 Principal Catharina Christensen: Commuter School

The Commuter School—a Folkschool with 400 students and 60 teachers is situated in a middle-class suburb to Copenhagen. The principal, Catharina Christensen, complained that the dialogue between the school and local authority had gone down to a very low level and was being substituted by written principles now that the municipality had been merged. As a result, the distance from local authorities and schools has increased along with a growing number of schools and other institutions under each local authority administrator's supervision.

4.3 Democratic Instructional Leadership Amidst Accountability and School Reforms

The Australian, US, and Danish leaders find themselves in a relatively new crossfire of conflicting expectations that cause new dilemmas in school leadership. For example, in Denmark, one can illustrate the difference in expectations by pointing to the fact that Danish schools used to live by a traditional vision of "Democratic Bildung", the understanding that schools should take a very comprehensive approach to education. This understanding is challenged by the expectation that schools should focus on basic skills like literacy and numeracy. Further, in the

past, school leaders had very broad room for interpretation and manoeuvre based on trust, but that trust has been challenged by a strong political and administrative interest in having schools made accountable to authorities. Danish principals often described this move as a move from one kind of democracy—based on negotiation and participation—towards another that is based on bureaucratic transparency and accountability. Likewise, the Australian and US school principals must balance democratic or shared leadership processes (e.g. collaborative decision-making structures and processes) with growing pressures for high academic performance.

4.3.1 Sustaining Democratic Ideals

Across the three countries (United States, Australia, and Denmark), principals are struggling with sustaining their own and teachers' commitment to democratic ideals that embrace teacher leadership and growth along with parent, and student relations and communications. These contemporary principals must simultaneously fulfil external accountability expectations and nurture teacher and student needs, interests, and aspirations. The challenges of balancing democratic ideals and accountability pressures have intensified in light of increasing national demands for high student performance—demands that many teachers find too high and rapidly changing. The discussion of "producing results" and pursuing the comprehensive vision of democratic leadership and schools is one of the dilemmas principals must address, often in temporary day-to-day solutions.

For example, Australian Principal Vicki Forbes expressed this dilemma well when she stated,

> I think we have mistakenly believed that you can't have high expectations, rigor and care and support running together and integrated and that has been a mistake we have made in the way that schools have been managed…I think the real challenge is to have the two integrated and I think that is what I have tried to do.

Vicki has led substantial improvement in the school in terms of academic learning outcomes, whilst also developing a very supportive and caring environment for both students and staff. The school is not obsessed by results, and values the development of the whole person, whilst acknowledging that results are important. Indeed, a key feature of the improved results is the focus on developing good relationships amongst the school community.

Another Australian principal, Principal Jan Shrimpton, expressed her commitment to democratic ideals in terms of her focus on students, and her balance in achieving good student outcomes whilst showing care for students. Jan strongly believed that schools were for kids and this was demonstrated by her recruitment philosophy:

> We recruit for attitude. First of all they must be passionate about teaching, love kids, and want to be part of a team. Then skills come second.

Interestingly, it is this strongly held philosophy that may also be preventing the school from improving further. Jan had clearly turned this school around, but over the past few years key student learning outcomes had plateaued. The school described itself as a "good" but not a "great" school. Jan's belief in focusing on a holistic approach to learning rather than being driven only by literacy and numeracy results may have contributed to this. She agreed that her philosophy was at odds with the current government emphases on schools focusing strongly on improving literacy and numeracy outcomes. Jan has now retired and she believed that it was time for a new person to take the school to the next level. She explained this by discussing a nearby school where, whilst the results had dramatically improved, the principal "had dragged staff kicking and screaming" to achieve these results. It was something that she would never do though as it conflicted with her emphasis on working with staff, parents, and students in a supportive and caring way to develop the whole child, rather than to just be results focused.

The US principals experienced similar tensions and dilemmas with regards to the creation of supportive and empowering school environments that also achieved high academic results in a short period of time. Although these US principals ranged in terms of experience and curriculum philosophy, they all shared a strong belief in education as a vehicle to democratize opportunities social equity. Each principal set a clear course that encouraged a sense of common purpose within her respective school community. At each site, the mission was made explicit: the needs of children were paramount and everyone would work together to improve their life chances. Throughout the data collection, the US team came to appreciate the depth of the principals' beliefs and commitments to create safe and effective schools.

Given that their children's needs were paramount, the first step each principal took was to make sure that students felt safe and cared for and that they were provided a secure, nurturing environment, so that they could comfortably avail themselves of the opportunity to learn (Jacobson et al. 2007). While the US principals felt heavy accountability pressures, they also used evidence of poor performance on state-administered tests to leverage much-needed instructional improvements (Jacobson et al. 2005). These principals recognized and had empathy for children living in poverty, yet none would allow these conditions to be used as excuses for poor academic achievement. They all recognized the need for intense staff development in order to provide teachers with the knowledge and skills needed to improve teaching and learning in their schools. In particular, the Fraser principal created a vibrant Arts program, a strategy that helped her keep the curriculum from becoming too narrow.

At Fraser, the most fully developed US case, the principal clearly stated her belief in democratic ideals of education when she stated, "I think the purpose of schools should be to provide all children the best possible chance to be productive and ethical citizens." The parents recognized and supported the principal's beliefs and ideals. For example, one principal stated, "[The principal] really believes that the school can help provide my kid with the best chance to do well in this world, to get a good job, and be as successful as any of the kids that have more money."

Likewise, teachers knew that they had opportunities and responsibilities to contribute their best ideas and work to the school. One teacher's comments were typical of many others when she stated, "If you do not want to give your best work to the school and make all children successful, then this is not the place for you."

The Costello (US) principal also co-opted the staff to abide by curriculum decisions, albeit through the use of the standardized America's Choice program. The America's Choice program required at least 80% of the staff to commit to curriculum decisions—commitments that many teachers found difficult in light of the school's challenging population. She was determined to create a supportive and high-performing school environment for children, i.e. not allowing the children's challenging circumstance to be used as a rationale for poor performance. Teachers who had spent much of their career in the school either did not believe that higher performance was possible, or did not possess the professional "will or skill" to achieve results better than those in the past. The structure of America's Choice gave teachers "the skill" with professional development and "the will" and commitment through collaborative governance. America's Choice required 80% teacher support prior to initiation of the program at Costello. The introduction of the America's Choice literacy program also made the emphasis upon higher academic achievement easier to maintain, but issues of workload, the amount of "progress tracking" paperwork attached to the program, and lingering professional distrust of the principal's high expectations continue to slow progress.

There was even slower progress at the Hamilton School (United States), primarily because, in the principal's words, "I had to deal with major student behavioral issues and instructional problems before the overall democratic mission, values, and teacher leadership could receive the attention it deserved." In a subsequent interview, the principal talked about her goals for participatory leadership at the school when she said, "I believe teachers need to have a say in decision-making in the school. I would like to be more democratic with teachers and students, but for now, I need to set the direction and provide more training." Many Hamilton teachers confirmed the lack of teacher leadership in the school. As one teacher put it,

> As far as the role of teachers go, there isn't, I mean a leader among teachers. There are committees. Teachers are voluntarily chosen. We meet on our own time and we correspond to our group leader and we talk among the faculty. We meet two or three times a year, tops.

It is important to remember that the Hamilton principal was inexperienced, and yet she brought order to a chaotic school situation and quickly improved student achievement scores at her SURR school. She had a strong mental model of the Fraser school's democratic ideals and values from her internship and good intentions to enact shared decision-making structures, but she was not able to achieve that goal at the end of our data collection.

Similarly, in Denmark, the principal and deputy of the Commuting School were still very clear in stating their position on the school's democratic values and direction, even in the midst of growing accountability pressures. They had developed a number of forms of self-governance and social technologies, which on the one hand,

provided opportunities for teacher participation, and at the same time demanded a high level of personal commitment. This can be seen in the focus on teacher teamwork where tasks were distributed to teams and at the same time demanding that the teams take on the responsibilities for both planning and evaluating the tasks. The Danish North School staff and leadership group all participated in deciding together the principles and values for the inclusive school. The leadership obliges (co-opts) the staff to abide the decisions, morally as well as in practice.

4.3.2 Fostering Authentic Democratic Participation

While organizational reform policies and structures varied across the three countries, most of the principals made concerted efforts to foster authentic democratic participation in decision-making in spite of tighter district-school or municipal governance-school coupling and simultaneous accountability pressures. While Australian policies generally require organizational reforms around decentralization, the Danish policies create tighter coupling and hierarchical arrangements that are challenging the traditional structures and cultures of negotiation and participation. In the United States, many states and districts require participatory decision-making or site-based management, but the overarching political demands revolve around accountability. In other words, today's principals/head teachers must help groups work with and through tensions between meeting accountability mandates and fostering curriculum improvement ideas that emerge "from the ground up".

Three years ago, the local Danish authority demanded that all schools in the municipality should have self-governing teams. Danish schools regarded tighter organizational couplings to be a move towards governing through accountability, contracts and network. This meant that management changed from prescriptive, direct influence and power, towards negotiation by setting the agenda. There is also more institutionalized power: Management from one level to the other is done at a distance, with the superior-level setting the framework and the agenda for the organizational levels and leaving it to the inferior levels to make things happen.

Leadership in the Danish Commuting School is now done at a distance through setting the agenda at plenary meetings and through collaboration with teacher teams. The leaders (the principal and deputy) of the Commuting School are still very clear in stating their position on the values and the direction the school should develop according to democratic ideals. They had developed a number of forms of self-governance and social technologies, which on the one hand, provided opportunities for teacher participation, and on the other hand, demanded a high level of personal commitment. The leadership was working to develop the school into a learning organization. There was a considerable, albeit not unequivocal, support from the staff. In this school, leadership was informed about teaching in classes as the deputy often visited classes and was therefore able to develop a nuanced image of teachers' instructional practice and act as critical friend to teachers.

All principals report that they are focusing more on collaborating with parents. For a period of time the principal of the Danish Commuter School participated at all parent class meetings in order to discuss the values of the school. The principal of the North School also emphasized the use of test results to legitimize the work of the school to parents. The principal of the Danish West School underscored the need to see parents as collaborators to new teachers, because she was convinced that only a close collaboration between school and families could facilitate the upbringing of children. That is in accordance with the Act on the Folkeskole where it is stated "the Folkeskole shall in collaboration with the parents and the students give the students knowledge and skills…." (Bekendtgørelse af Lov om Folkeskolen 2007, § 1). It is here directly demanded from the school that it has a close collaboration with the parents.

At the Danish Commuter School, the principal reports that the hierarchy has become steeper in recent years. The principal has a new role as the go-between the local leadership teams at the school, i.e. the leadership team and the teams of department leaders and the school directorate. In addition to that, the principal feels a general need to strengthen the leadership group vis-à-vis the school direction, but also vis-à-vis the teachers and parents. She says that she needs an internal leadership forum where they can discuss matters concerning the whole school, because "otherwise it becomes me that has to decide everything". In other words the principal sees herself as the central person, as an intermediate link between the school's environment and the school. Because of her democratic disposition she has been working to draw more leaders into the decision processes. It is a bit like a "them versus us" position, and not the close cooperation with the parents that is foreseen in the Act of the Folkeskole. So it is questionable if this collaboration with the parents is considered as a good or a necessary evil.

At the Danish West School the principal considered herself part of a leadership team, stating, "We are at hand when needed." She mentioned that leadership teams are needed and used primarily as conflict mediators. Otherwise she considered the leadership team as a service body to the teachers and she believed that the leadership team should "keep their fingers to themselves" if not called upon by the teachers. It may be considered as a rather passive and weak attitude towards the teachers. It may, on the other hand, also be interpreted as influential and a consequence of the beginning of the distribution of leadership tasks to the teachers in a distributed leadership (Spillane 2006).

At the Danish North School, the principal had established self-governing teams much longer, and because many teachers were resistant to the teams, he conducted close and direct supervision. Further, because the inclusive model of team decision-making was so closely connected to the school's values, he involved the whole staff in self-governance regardless of early resistance. Here the principal's way of influence was to set the agenda and define what was to be done. One may call it a co-option strategy (Klausen 2001) in which the principal co-opts the staff and thereby binds it to the results of participation. The principal explained it this way: "I try to create the room for involvement. I think that it is important to create a room for discussion."

The US Fraser Academy converted to a charter school during the course of data collection. As a result, there was a major staff turnover as many experienced teachers left the building in order to retain their union seniority. Because the Fraser decision-making teams included many new teachers, the Fraser principal spent more time with the school-based teams, modelling processes for shared decision-making and supporting teacher discussions. In her words, "I model how to make decisions collaboratively, but I gradually distribute leadership and release responsibility so that teachers can take the lead. I'm there as needed again, but for quite a while I had to be more of a direct presence on these teams than when I had more of an experienced staff." She also admitted that much of the conversations, while purposeful, now revolved around student achievement data.

The US Fraser principal also gradually focused the school's interrelated set of leadership teams on student-centred literacy curriculum from the Teachers College project. Through these team structures, teachers learned how to communicate more openly about student learning and how to become more active learners themselves. The principal also used these shared decision-making structures to build and sustain capacity for instructional leadership and research-based teaching practices. As one teacher put it, "[The principal] practices what she preaches about authentic, active learning and high performance with the adults in the school. You're expected to be a learner and implement that learning effectively in your classroom." Likewise, the principal stated,

> I've always felt that team effort is really better than individual effort, and I've learned how to work with people…I've always invited people to work with me, and I've learned how to work with people better, and be a better listener. And know that there is a solution to every single problem, and if I'm stumped just throw it out, you know, and a solution will come from that. I've learned that, and in terms of learning I've learned from my parents and my staff and even students.

The US Colman principal also recognized the need to create room for shared decision-making teams to provide personal encouragement and support emerging teacher leadership. In the words of one of the teachers, she "boosts us up." Using these "teacher-run" committees, the principal developed and implemented a school-wide program of differentiated instruction (Tomlinson 2001) that gradually became the prevailing philosophy of the school. Because Colman experienced changing demographics while the federal and US government increased accountability pressures, teacher discussions about differentiated instructional philosophies and practices also focused on student achievement data albeit with less intense time, safety, and poverty issues than in the more urban counterparts (Fraser, Costello, and Hamilton).

The Colman case is an exemplary model of how to foster democratic instructional leadership and maintain high school performance in the midst of changing demographics. As accountability pressures increased, the Colman principal used test data to solidify the school's commitment to differentiated instruction and equitable achievement for the school's increasingly diverse population. In her words,

> Well, when I first came here, the teachers were doing a good solid job, but their instruction was not really student-centered. At the end of five years ago, five, six years ago, our school planning team met to develop goals that would improve student achievement. And

> this past year we worked the completion of that five-year plan. That five-year instructional plan included goals to improve student achievement on the State testing. And that was one goal. And the other was to create a learner-centered classroom and implement learner-centered best practices. And within that, those two—we call them design team, where we are designing programs to be implemented in the classroom. Within the study and implementation of the learner-centered best practices, we looked at things like learning styles, so we really got to know our learners. Cooperative learning. Developmentally appropriate practices, which are really important to help us meet the challenge of the students. We have to know and be able to plan, based on what's developmentally appropriate.

At another US case, the Costello principal created room for discussion about the America's Choice program because the program developers required 80% commitment from staff. Many teaches and staff members along with the principal herself told us that such democratic decision-making was not something the principal would have done naturally as part of her leadership style. Thus, she was fortunate to find a comprehensive program in America's Choice, one that required staff acceptance and peer coaching. Because the principal had a directive style overall, shared decision-making was confined to America's Choice, and many teachers recognized her as a top-down leader of instructional change. As indicated earlier, the US Hamilton School principal planned to develop vertical and horizontal teams, but there was little evidence of democratic decision-making processes at the time of data collection. Rather, she focused all attention on establishing school order and safety, high expectations for students, and improved classroom teaching practices aligned with the New York state tests.

Australian principal, Jan Shrimpton's leadership style, whilst also influential and purposeful, was open and invitational rather than confrontational, and included a collaborative and consultative approach to decision-making. Jan worked well with her assistant principal Julie, and relied on teachers taking on leadership roles. Indeed, it was clear that the success of the school relied on both Jan and Julie, and increasingly on teachers involved in leadership teams (e.g. professional learning teams had been developed at each year level). Likewise, Australian principal, Vicki Forbes, described how she encouraged and tried to motivate people to take risks, and how she used a delegating style in order to empower staff to take responsibility. For example, she noted that she often had to "accept a lesser job" than she would normally do herself in order to "let go and learn to delegate". While she thought that leadership was as much an art as a science, she believed that you had to be "strategic", particularly in how to meet policy guidelines. Students confirmed her style as "consultative"; they saw her as being very "professional", "very focused and motivated", "open door", and "business like". They felt that they could "say anything to her" and that she was "easy to interact with". Teachers also described her as being collaborative but one who was prepared to make hard decisions. Many teachers stated that they had ownership of philosophical and curriculum changes in the school because they were able to participate in curriculum decisions. At the same time, Jan and the other Australian principal cases clearly recognized the challenges involved in fostering democratic participation in the midst of growing accountability pressures.

4.3.3 Sustaining Authentic Curriculum Amidst Accountability Pressures

In general, there has become more focus on the students' basic skills in all of the schools across all three national contexts. In particular, there is evidence that all of the schools experienced some narrowing of curriculum, focusing on literacy and numeracy. At the same time, the principals and other interviewees told us that accountability helped them leverage much-needed improvements, particularly in the challenging, high-poverty schools (i.e. Hamilton and Fraser, United States; Bellfield, Australia; and Commuter, Denmark).

In Denmark, this more narrow curriculum focus on student outcomes can be seen in connection with external demands that schools must document the results of their work through quality reports, for example, putting the tests results of the older students on the ministry's web-site. But it is also a consequence of the rather disappointing results of the PISA reports and of recommendations of OECD. This development illustrates that there is an increased focus on accountability. In other words, looking across the three Denmark case study schools, a general picture emerges that the ministry's tightening of the demands of Danish schools and the local authorities' closer focus on the schools' results have resulted in a heightening of attention on the students' academic outcomes. At the Commuter School, the principal mentions that they have spent more and more time working on test preparation in the areas of math and literacy, and their efforts have resulted in improvements in both subject areas.

At the Danish West School, which is a school with many bi-lingual students, the principal believed that the students' lingual capabilities matter when Danish is not the only spoken language in the school. That may be the reason why the principal had not noticed any improvement in the students' tests results. This school is the only one of these three schools where the students' marks are still beneath the country's average for the school leavers. However, the school is adding value in producing test results above what is expected.

With the school authorities' increasing focus on the basics in schools, this trend is also evident at the Danish North School where there has been a change away from cross-disciplinary instruction to more mono-disciplinary instruction. The principal says that it is difficult to document students' outcome of the instruction because there only is little research in this area. Despite the lack of research on the students' outcome of the instruction, the principal was of the opinion that their subject knowledge is "second to none" and that "we stress the interdisciplinary instruction" even if it has been weakened by the external demands to the school.

Likewise, some of the US principals were very creative in how they attained high student performance on basic skills tests and yet sustained authentic curriculum and instructional practices (Ylimaki 2007). For example, Mary Romano, the Colman principal, talked at length about the school's differentiated, child-centred curriculum in the midst of state standard policies and accountability pressures. In her words,

> Our curriculum is totally child-centered. Very rigorous standards and everything. And the standards were here. But how to reach the standards had changed over time. So, you really have to move very slowly and appropriately. When there's a lot of scrutiny, where there's

> a lot of conservative views in terms of teaching, practices, and the whole community, we have kept to what we feel is in the best interests of students.

Because Colman teachers had ownership of the curriculum philosophy and practices, they were willing to implement differentiated instruction for students of varying abilities in spite of state and federal pressures to retain and improve student performance. The US Fraser principal expressed similar commitments to deep student engagement and authentic pedagogy regardless of current policies that appear to support a particular set of neoconservative ideologies that emphasize basic, skills-based pedagogy. As she put it, "We have to deal with the tests, but we also have to remember that students must love reading and writing, too." As noted previously, Fraser Academy has been recognized by the state for excellent academic performance on state assessments.

When Australian principal, Vicki Forbes, arrived at the school, she believed the school was "coasting". Consequently, she made "teaching and learning" a major focus. The challenge was to "get inside the classroom door to improve teacher and student learning". As she put it, "We must be the only profession in the world that doesn't learn through observation. You have to encourage people to get into each other's classrooms…. It is that sharing and the trust that you have with that colleague that will enable you to develop your own skills." Other strategies included debating issues in staff forums, professional reading, and exchanging new ideas. A change in culture in staff meetings also helped to focus efforts on improving teaching and learning. Rarely was that time now used for administrative matters. Meetings were held once a fortnight with every second meeting characterized by the Head of Teaching and Learning as "ten minutes of shared reading and by 'think, pair, share' sessions about 'what we believe about teaching and learning'".

Relationships with teachers, students, and the community are a cornerstone of Vicki's leadership. Students have been encouraged to develop a strong work ethic, the success of which is evidenced by the high year-12 results. But just as importantly,

> …There is an enormous amount of encouragement to get the best out of the students so that in a way we do make a success of it whether we get the results or not. (Head of Department)

Whether it was in the schoolyard, in her office, or at other school and social activities, Vicki made a point of establishing a trusting relationship with students and influencing how they viewed school. She used the language of high expectations with teachers and students: "This is where the language we use is so powerful. It is not just about achievement, it's about being the best you can be, it's about challenging and stretching yourself."

Australian Principal John Fleming embraced the more traditional, skills-based instruction, particularly in the area of literacy. John's approach to literacy development focused on explicit instruction and the development of phonemic awareness.

> We believe in explicit instruction—we will teach kids how to do these things. Our Kids are very strong readers, very strong spellers. They are strong spellers because they know how to break words into parts and they know what letter sound combinations come together—very strong on phonemic awareness and very strong on phonics.

John loves the challenge of helping people to develop, and particularly enjoys working with teachers to improve their practice. John works extensively with teachers

and expects all to show commitment to the students and to the school, and to want to improve. He realizes that not all the teachers will be extraordinary teachers, but if they are willing to support the school direction and to work to improve their practice, then John will support them "100 percent". For John getting the most out of teachers is about creating high expectations and a data-driven learning environment.

The US Hamilton Principal had similar goals for school success, but she did not have a strong background in curriculum and pedagogy. As one teacher attests, "When she came here, she had some ideas but not a lot to work with. She just kept saying, "We're going to make this work and it will." In order to "make it work", the Hamilton principal had to be extremely creative; she even taught an eighth-grade math class herself when she could not find a qualified teacher. Many teachers and staff members commended the Hamilton principal for her "hands-on" efforts at school improvement; however, they often described her professional development efforts as a series of "discrete activities" rather than a shared, cohesive plan. In fact, many teachers and the principal herself described her first-year progress as persistence moving in fits and starts. Essentially, the Hamilton principal rolled up her sleeves, taught classes herself, and ultimately used accountability to pressure teachers to adopt instructional changes in their classrooms. At the same time, the Hamilton principal and assistant principal admit that most of those classroom instruction changes were directly aimed at the improvement of student behaviour and the state test results. The following teacher comments are typical of many and their frustration over accountability pressures:

> Teacher 1: I would like to see some of those [policymakers] from Washington D.C. come into my classroom and sit for a day and see what the kids have to go through with these tests so that the school can qualify for grants. Everything looks fine on paper…. but I think they're expecting too much and mastery of nothing. So if we could just concentrate—especially up to fourth grade—on reading, writing, and math, instead of all of these extensive skills lists, children would do better.
>
> Teacher 2: Fourth grade is tough because we're published in the paper, and I highly resent our school being compared with Gifted and Talented City Honors—it's not a fair comparison that they do in the paper. And it warps the picture to parents and community members.
>
> Teacher 3: We're becoming successful at teaching to the tests and getting the test grades up.

In spite of these frustrations about accountability, the Hamilton principal and staff used accountability to leverage much-needed improvements in math and literacy instruction. At the same time, the Hamilton principal and many teachers recognized that their curriculum was rather narrow and largely aligned with the basic literacy and math skills emphasized on New York State tests.

4.4 Conclusions

Across the three countries, principals and teachers are struggling with sustaining their own and teachers' commitment to democratic school relations and "hands-on" authentic curricula in their schools. Today's principals must simultaneously support the work of living up to external expectations and at the same time respect and care for staff and students. This has become a more challenging task than before because

principals and teachers often find that the external demands and expectations are too high, some of the political and public expectations are changing rapidly, and not necessarily supportive of democratic purposes of schooling. Yet, a standout feature of the principals is that they are all good at not only working within their contexts, but also creatively using these contexts to foster the development of outstanding school communities.

Findings across the US, Australian, and Danish cases also reveal principals who are "successful" to varying degrees relative to student performance. Yet each defines success more broadly than aggregated standardized test scores. In fact, many of these principals were all very creative in how they attained high student performance on basic skills tests and yet sustained authentic curriculum and instructional practices. All of the principals are concerned with social equity and authentic curriculum for the whole child, including their emotional, cultural, and social needs, in addition to academics. Furthermore, these principals are all deeply committed to democratic participation and community development in ways that respect and respond to the national and local cultures in which their schools are situated. Further, findings across these countries suggest that successful instructional leadership involves both direct and indirect practices, and the balance of direct–indirect leadership is influenced and shaped by the context in which it occurs.

While there are many similarities across the Australian, Danish, and US cases, there are distinctions. For example, organizational reform policies and structures varied across the three countries. In Australia, participatory or democratic management reforms emphasize decentralization; however, the Danish policies create tighter coupling and hierarchical arrangements that are challenging the traditional structures and cultures of negotiation and participation. In the United States, many states and districts require participatory decision-making or site-based management, but the overarching political demands revolve around accountability.

As schools around the world become increasingly diverse, examples of successful leadership, particularly in multiethnic schools, are poorly represented in the research literature. We believe these cross national and intra-national understandings provide an important beginning in the establishment of international "profiles of democratic instructional leaders" that can contribute to our understanding of leadership practice and provide implications for the preparation of instructional leaders who are more responsive to the democratic purposes of schooling and the needs of "real schools" throughout the world.

References

Airey, J., Drewett Gray, J., & Flecknoe, M. (2004) *Pupil agency in directing learning: A crossover trial.* Paper presented at the 7th International BELMAS/SCRELM Research Conference, St. Catherine's College, Oxford, 8–10 July.

Allington, R. (2002). *Big brother and the national reading curriculum: How ideology trumped evidence.* Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum, 25th Anniversary* (3rd edn.). New York: Routledge.
Barth, R. S. (2001). Teacher leader. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82,* 443–449.
Beane, J. A., & Apple, M. W. (1999). The case for democratic schools. In M. W. Apple & J. A. Beane (Eds.), *Democratic schools, lessons from chalk face.* Buckingham: Open University Press.
Blasé, J., Blase, J., Anderson, G. L., & Dungan, S. (1995). *Democratic principals in action. Eight pioneers.* Thousand Oaks: Corwin.
Caldwell, B. J., Gurr, D., Hill, P. W., & Rowe, K. J. (1997). *The schools of the future program in Victoria, Australia: The principal perspective.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, March.
Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy in education.* New York: Macmillan.
Flecknoe, M. (2004). Transformative approaches to student voice: Theoretical underpinnings, recalcitrant realities. *British Educational Research Journal, 30*(2), 295–322.
Gale, T., & Densmore, K. (2003). Democratic educational leadership in contemporary times. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 6*(2), 119–136.
Giles, C., Johnson, L., Brooks, S., & Jacobson, S. (2005). Building bridges, building community: Transformational leadership in a challenging urban context. *Journal of School Leadership, 15*(5), 519–545.
Glickman, C., Gordon, S., & Ross-Gordon, J. (2009). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (8th edn.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.
Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2005). Models of successful principal leadership. *School Leadership and Management, 26*(4), 371–395.
Jacobson, S., Johnson, L., Ylimaki, R., & Giles, C. (2005). Successful school leadership in changing times: Cross national findings in the third year of an international research project. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 607–618.
Jacobson, S., Brooks, S., Giles, C., Johnson, L., & Ylimaki, R. (2007). Successful leadership in three high poverty urban elementary schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(4), 1–27.
Klausen, K. K. (2001). *Skulle det være noget særligt?* [Is this supposed to be special?]. København: Børsen Offentlig ledelse.
Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools.* Alexandria: ASCD.
Moos, L. (2003). *Pædagogisk ledelse—om ledelsesopgaven og relationerne i uddannelsesinstitutioner* [Educational leadership—on the leadership task and relations in educational institutions]. Copenhagen: Børsen.
Moos, L. (2008). School leadership for 'democratic building': Fundamentalist beliefs or critical reflection? *School Leadership and Management, 28*(3), 229–246.
Moos, L., Krejsler, J., & Kofod, K. K. (2007). *Meninger i ledelse—succesfuld skoleledelse mellem visioner og selvledelse* [Senses in leadership—successful school leadership between visions and selfleadership]. Frederikshavn: Dafolo.
No Child Left Behind Act. (2002). Stronger accountability for stronger results. www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml. Accessed 28 Sep 2003.
Pike, B. (2009). Victoria's school reform agenda, Melbourne Graduate School of Education 2009 Dean's lecture, June 3, 2009. www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/news/lectures/2009series.html. Accessed 14 June 2009.
Shannon, P. (2001). *Becoming political, too.* Portsmouth: Heinemann.
Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
Tomlinson, C. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed ability classrooms.* Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
Woods, P. A. (2005). *Democratic leadership in education.* London: Paul Chapman.
Ylimaki, R. M. (2007). Instructional leadership in challenging US schools. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 11–19.
Ylimaki, R., & McClain, L. (2009). Wisdom centered educational leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 12*(1), 13–33.

Chapter 5
Culturally Responsive Practices

Lauri Johnson, Jorunn Møller, Petros Pashiardis, Gunn Vedøy and Vassos Savvides

5.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to explore how successful leadership for diversity is defined, negotiated, and addressed in selected policy documents and culturally diverse schools across three countries—Norway, the USA, and Cyprus. This analysis of leadership practice is based on data from selected International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP) case studies. We start by outlining the theoretical framework and our methodological approach. In order to provide the reader with a better understanding of the three national contexts within which the study is located, we provide a brief overview of governance and public educational policy in Norway, the USA (New York State) and Cyprus. In our cross-country analysis we focus on national and local policy issues related to cultural inclusiveness and diversity. We then summarize findings from the case studies. Above all, we will discuss how school leaders negotiate a balance between honouring student home cultures and emphasizing students' learning and achievement in the mainstream culture, as well as the role that all stakeholders play in the democratic life of the school. We argue that principals who are deemed successful because of increased student achievement must also be evaluated in light of their ability to respond to the needs and perspectives of students and their families from diverse racial, ethnic, and religious groups.

5.2 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this chapter combines two complementary lenses for understanding leadership practices in diverse schools that were developed in previous studies of the ISSPP case studies in the USA and Norway and reported in a special issue of the *International Studies in Educational Administration* (see Johnson

L. Johnson (✉)
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, USA
e-mail: lauri.johnson@bc.edu

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5_5, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

2007; Vedoy and Moller 2007). These are culturally responsive leadership (Ladson-Billings 1995a, b; Johnson 2007) and leadership for democratic education (i.e. Furman and Starratt 2002; Møller 2002, 2006; Vedøy and Møller 2007). These two perspectives are combined in the present chapter to illustrate the significant dilemmas educational leaders have to manoeuvre in-between in order to meet the needs and expectations for schooling in diverse contexts. Culturally responsive leadership discusses how historically repressive structures in education can be addressed at the group level in order to empower students and parents. The theoretical framework of democratic education offers an approach to leadership in diverse settings at the individual level of rights, needs, and participation. These two perspectives reveal a major issue in dealing with diversity, namely the essentialist and the processual approaches. According to Baumann (1999), essentialist approaches understand concepts like culture, religion, and ethnicity as "fixed". In this view, culture is something one has and is a member of, rather than something one makes and reshapes through continual activity. Processual approaches, on the other hand, see culture as "fluid". Essentialists often regard the processual approach as too relativistic and without values while the processual argument is that essentialist approaches create categories that do not fit for living people in "the real world". Both perspectives are important in order to understand and improve educational policies and practices for diversity (Baumann 1999; Castles 2005; Wilkinson 2008).

5.2.1 Culturally Responsive Leadership

Culturally responsive leadership practices are those that incorporate the history, values, and cultural knowledge of students' home communities in the school curriculum, work to develop a critical consciousness among both students and faculty to challenge inequities in the larger society, and empower parents from diverse communities. Ladson-Billings coined the term "culturally relevant pedagogy" in *The Dreamkeepers* (1994), her now classic study of eight exemplary teachers of African American students. This instructional approach arises from previous anthropological work that noted a cultural mismatch between students from culturally diverse backgrounds and their white middle-class teachers, particularly in terms of language and verbal participation structures. In Ladson-Billings' (1995a, b) view, culturally relevant pedagogy rests on three propositions: (a) students must experience academic success; (b) students must develop and/or maintain cultural competence, and (c) students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the social order.

While much of the research on culturally responsive practices has been applied to classroom teaching, recent efforts have attempted to apply a culturally responsive framework to school leadership. These studies have identified culturally responsive principals as those who emphasize high expectations for student academic achievement, exhibit an ethic of care or "empowerment through care", and maintain a commitment and connection to the larger community (e.g. Reitzug and Patterson 1998;

Scheurich 1998; Johnson 2006). In her review of the literature on the principal's role in creating inclusive schools, Riehl (2000) also identifies three tasks that determine whether administrators are prepared to respond to diversity and demonstrate multicultural leadership. These include fostering new definitions of diversity; promoting inclusive instructional practices within schools by supporting, facilitating, or being a catalyst for change; and building connections between schools and communities.

5.2.2 Leadership for Democratic Education

Leadership for democratic education arises from research at the intersection of educational leadership, critical theory, and critical multiculturalism. It is rooted in theories of social justice that examine institutions that exist for the common good (i.e. Dewey 1916; Freire 1970). Most definitions of "education for democracy" include themes like: (1) recognizing the basic value and rights of each individual; (2) taking the standpoint of others into consideration; (3) deliberation in making decisions; (4) embracing plurality and difference; and (5) promoting equity and social justice (Møller 2006). This approach also has much in common with the essence of our understanding of *democratic leadership* (i.e. Furman and Shields 2005; Furman and Starratt 2002; Møller 2002, 2006; Woods 2005). Through the educational system, all citizens should be given the opportunity to participate in the development of a free, multicultural, and democratic society (Larson and Murtadha 2002).

Kalantzis and Cope (1999) describe how schools can work for diversity through an understanding of critical multiculturalism. Their perspective is closely related to the way we have framed leadership for democratic education. *Firstly*, they argue that education is a way to give all students opportunities for social mobility in society. This means that basic skills like reading, writing, and calculation ought to be focused on. These are tools students need in order to gain social access. To be able to carry this through as a multicultural project, they stress that one of the core values in this education has to be multiculturalism; with a value-laden understanding that we live in a multicultural society in development, a society objected to constant negotiation and re-negotiations. *Secondly*, they emphasize that if it is a goal to ensure all students social access and opportunities for mobility, the majority's culture and pedagogy have to be explicit. This means that education itself and its objective ought to be explicit, and there ought to be meta-concepts to describe it. Yet this explicitness of the culture of schooling ought not be a means of assimilation. *Thirdly*, Kalantzis and Cope argue that all students ought to be educated in cultural and linguistic diversity. When the goal is equal social access compensatory education should be provided, for instance, NSL (Norwegian as a second language) within a Norwegian context, first language tuition and bilingual content instructions as tools to reach the goal. *Finally*, they stress the role of teachers as authorities and professional educators in schools. Teachers play a key part to ensure students social access later in life. By acting as authorities in education and in their respective subjects and by having high expectations for all students, they can contribute to raise opportunities for all students.

5.3 Methods

The analysis of leadership practice is based on data from ISSPP case studies in the USA (New York State), Norway, and Cyprus. These data have been re-analysed in order to compare how successful leadership for diversity is defined, negotiated, and addressed in culturally diverse schools across the three countries. In addition, selected policy documents are examined to highlight and compare national educational contexts of cultural diversity. In reading, interpreting, and analysing the interviews we have found it helpful to explore Lieblich et al.'s (1998) distinctions between form and content and between making sense of whole stories and dividing them into segments or categories. In addition, in analysing policy documents our approach is inspired by critical discourse analysis which defines a discourse as "a practice not just of representing the world, but of signifying the world, constituting and constructing the world in meaning" (Fairclough 1992, p. 64). In this chapter, we will highlight the principals' role in multicultural education across countries and how their beliefs, attitudes, and focus have an impact on education for diversity. The policy documents will be examined first. The concern is with the language used in these documents. Language is treated as a social practice; a way of doing things. The analysis aims to explore as well as challenge the meanings about diversity embedded in these policy documents.

5.4 Framing the Cross-National Policy Contexts

5.4.1 The Educational Context of Cultural Diversity in Norway

Norwegian education policy was intended to create both equal and equitable life conditions for all social groups, regardless of social background, gender, ethnicity, and geographical location. Equity in elementary Norwegian education has at least three meanings. The first is equal access to the educational system. Fairness is understood as the educational system's ability to distribute financial and economic resources in order to meet the needs of all the users in a way that provides equal opportunities. The second aspect concerns equity at the individual level. This addresses the diversity among students and therefore the necessity for unequal treatment in order to meet individual learning abilities (e.g. greater resources for greater needs). The third aspect concerns equity at the group level. For instance, there is a collective right for minority language students to receive additional language tuition.

More than 95% of Norwegian students are enrolled in ordinary classes in public schools.[1] In terms of socio-economic status, there is a fairly narrow income

[1] The structure of the Norwegian school system is 10 years of compulsory primary and lower secondary education and three years of optional upper secondary education. School starts at age six and 90% of the students stay in school until at least age eighteen.

range between wealthier Norwegian families and those less well off. For instance, in a recently conducted national survey which included perceptions about student background and attainment, Norwegian principals rated 78.1% of their students' socio-economic background as medium (middle class) and noted that 69.5% of their students had a supportive home educational environment. Only 9.1% students were characterized as having a low socio-economic background (Møller et al. 2006).

Due to recent migration, the student population in Norwegian schools is changing and becoming more multicultural and multilingual. By the end of 2005 the immigrant population constituted approximately 390,000 persons or 8.3% of the total population.[2] Current birth-rates at Norwegian hospitals indicate that one out of five children born today is born with one or two parents born abroad. This immigrant population is not a heterogeneous group, however. Norway has had immigration from 208 different nations, and no national groups constitute more than 7% of the total immigrant population (SSB 2006). Primary reasons for immigration are work, family reunion, or refuge. In primary and lower secondary education, the term "students from language minorities" is used. This term refers to students who need personalized instruction in the Norwegian language for some period of time in order to be able to participate in regular classes. Unlike *Statistics Norway's* definition, it does not include the entire immigrant population.[3]

Knowledge Promotion is the latest reform in compulsory education in Norway which took effect in August 2006. In the *Quality Framework*, a policy document formulated for both elementary and upper secondary education in connection with this reform, democracy and diversity are featured as important concepts:

> A clear foundation in values and a broad understanding of culture are fundamental for an inclusive social community and for a community of learning where diversity is acknowledged and respected. Such a learning environment gives room for cooperation, dialogue and negotiations. The students participate in democratic processes and can thus develop a democratic mind and understanding of active and engaged participation in a diverse society. (Ministry of Education and Research 2006, p. 2)

This underscores that giving equal access to knowledge and education within schools through recognition of differences within the school community is crucial, as is the development and practice of a democratic spirit. Moreover, it is stressed in policy documents that schools ought to reflect the students' cultural background. The content of these aims is a matter of continuous debate: they are subject to debate at the national level and may be interpreted differently from school to school, and again lead to differences in discourses and practises.

[2] *Statistics Norway*, the official Norwegian statistics agency, defines the immigrant population as first generation immigrants and their children.

[3] This definition also excludes the indigenous population of Norway, the Sámi and national minorities such as the Artic Finns (an older West Finnish immigrant group) and the Roma. For the Sámi there is an adapted Sámi Curriculum, and both the Sámi and the Artic Finns have the right to tuition in the Sámi language or in Finnish. The Roma people have no such rights. The Norwegian schools in this chapter are both located in southeastern Norway, which means the Sámi, Artic Finns, and the Roma people are not represented in the student population in the study.

5.4.2 Tensions in Norwegian Key Policy Documents

The Norwegian Education Act in 1998 stipulates that all activity in schools should be carried out in accordance with fundamental democratic, humanistic, and Christian values,[4] and that education should uphold and renew the national cultural heritage to provide perspective and guidance for the future. This policy refers to both the past and the future, and to both essentialist and processual understandings of education (Baumann 1999). This duality becomes further visible in the concretizations of the values in The Education Act, the Core Curriculum (CC), and the Quality Framework (QF) of the National Curriculum. The Core Curriculum is still in effect and was written in connection with the 1994 curriculum reform for upper secondary education and the 1997 curriculum reform for compulsory education. In the Core Curriculum, under the headline "The Spiritual Human Being", the core values for public education in Norway are specified:

> The Christian faith and tradition constitute a deep current in our history—a heritage that unites us as a people across religious persuasions. It has imprinted itself on the norms, worldview, concepts and art of the people. It bonds us to other peoples in the rhythm of the week and in common holidays, but is also an abiding presence in our own national traits: in architecture and music, in style and conventions, in ideas, idioms and identity. (CC 1993, p. 9)

In this excerpt from the Core Curriculum a clear us-them dichotomy is created. This heritage links "the Norwegian people" as an inseparable unit, in contrast to other "people" who implicitly are also described as inseparable units. A further excerpt in this document links democracy to Christian and humanistic values. In this instance the Core Curriculum represents an essentialist understanding of Norwegian national culture that is "fixed". When it comes to the description of individuals within schools, the following is stressed:

> Education should be based on the view that all persons are created equal and that human dignity is inviolable. It should confirm the belief that everyone is unique; that each can nourish his own growth and that individual distinctions enrich and enliven our world. (CC 1993, p. 9 f.)

Here all persons are described as unique and equal, and their human dignity is characterized as inviolable. Hopes of a diverse society that can nurture and value differences among people are stressed. Thus, this excerpt offers a processual understanding of diversity, where culture is fluid.

The Quality Framework uses the term "diverse" consequently and the focus on the national heritage, so strongly emphasized in the Core Curriculum, is lacking. In addition, while democracy is seen in relation to Christian and humanistic values and is implicitly understood in the Core Curriculum, the Quality Framework refers to Human Rights and the processual side of an understanding of democracy. Since both documents are a basis for governance in schools, this can be seen as a tension in the policy documents. The discourses in policy documents are ambiguous, and

[4] This reference to Christianity in the Education Act is heavily debated.

they can be interpreted broadly at every school. As such, the analysis indicates that the central choices concerning values in a diverse society have to be constructed and carried out at the school level.

5.4.3 *The Educational Context of Cultural Diversity in the United States*

A central feature of American public education is that governance and funding are highly decentralized. Despite increasingly high-profile federal legislation, education in the United States is the responsibility of 50 similar, but constitutionally autonomous, state systems. State education departments (SED) delegate considerable power and responsibility to local school districts that, in turn, are overseen by elected school boards. In 2000 there were 14,700 school districts serving 47 million children in the United States from pre-kindergarten through grade 12. New York State, the location of the U.S. ISSPP case studies, has over 700 school districts.

Historically American society has always been culturally diverse, made up of voluntary immigrants (initially from Europe but now increasingly from Latin America and Asia), involuntary immigrants of African and Mexican descent who were incorporated by slavery and conquest, and a Native population representing over 600 federal- and state-recognized tribal groups. At the dawn of the twenty-first century, U.S. schools have never been more linguistically, culturally, religiously, ethnically, and racially diverse (Prewitt 2002). Students of colour (i.e. Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian American, and Native American) make up 43% of the national public school population. In some states, like California, and in the 20 largest urban school districts across the country, students of colour constitute an overwhelming majority of the school population. Nationwide, 18.4% of school-age youth speak a language other than English at home. In some urban school districts, over 100 different languages are spoken.

Despite the changing face of America, however, students from diverse racial, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds continue to experience unequal educational opportunities in schools. The racial achievement gap between white students and African American and Latino students has remained stagnant. The average 12th-grade low-income student of colour reads at the same level as the average 8th-grade middle-class white student. In terms of high school completion, according to the 2000 census, 88% of white students have graduated from high school, but the rate for Hispanics is just 56%.

Increasing demographic diversity in the USA is occurring within a political and social context of high accountability, resegregation, and fiscal inequities between urban and suburban school districts (see, e.g., Kozol 2005; Rebell 2005, Orfield et al. 2002). Poor urban schools must raise test scores on state-mandated assessments with fewer resources or face reorganization and possible closure. In 2002 the federal "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB) Act required states to administer annual benchmarked proficiency tests in reading and math to all students in grades 3–8.

Schools failing to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) towards 100% proficiency are deemed in need of improvement and continued lack of AYP triggers progressively severe sanctions, including reconstitution, replacement of staff, or designation as a charter school.

Because school funding in the USA is highly dependent on local property values, marked social and economic disparities exist between high-poverty urban districts and their more affluent suburban neighbours. These "savage inequalities" (Kozol 2005) have been exacerbated by accountability mandates that are particularly damaging to the education opportunities of children that remain in high need schools.

5.4.4 Tensions in American Diversity Policies

Policy analyses often date America's response to racial and cultural diversity in the schools from the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* which declared ''separate but equal'' education for African American students as unconstitutional (e.g. Gollnick 1995). Yet recent historical case studies indicate that grass roots efforts to address issues of cultural pluralism began in U.S. urban school districts much earlier in the late 1930s and early 1940s. Known at the time as intercultural or intergroup education, this precursor to multicultural education contrasted America's stated democratic ideals of freedom and equality of opportunity with the historical reality of ongoing prejudice and discrimination in an effort to "make democracy real" for those diverse groups who were disenfranchised and marginalized from the school system (Johnson 2002). This discursive strategy, of holding up the promise of America's democratic principles and foundational documents to highlight those who have been excluded from that vision, has been used effectively by civil rights advocates throughout U.S. history.

In the absence of a national policy framework that promotes cultural pluralism, the context for state and local multicultural policies in the United States has been based on conceptual models described by multicultural theorists such as Sleeter and Grant (2009) and J. A. Banks and C. A. M. Banks (2006). The New York City *Statement of Policy on Multicultural Education and Promotion of Positive Intergroup Relations* developed in the late 1980s (New York Board of Education 1989) is a good example of a local school district policy based on Banks' model.

The conceptual framework developed by Sleeter and Grant (2009) identifies five different approaches that address human diversity—race, ethnicity, gender, social class, disability, and sexual orientation: (1) *teaching the exceptional and culturally different* aims to assimilate students of colour into the cultural mainstream and existing social structure, equipping people of colour with the knowledge and skills to achieve in schools and society; (2) a *human relations approach* aims to promote tolerance and acceptance, reduce stereotyping, and promote students' self-concepts; (3) *single-group studies* focus on the experiences, contributions, and concerns of distinct cultural, ethnic, gender, and social class groups to promote structural equality and recognition of the identified group (e.g. African Americans and women);

(4) *multicultural education* promotes equal opportunity in schools, cultural pluralism, respect for diverse peoples, and support for power equity among groups; and (5) *multicultural social justice education*, which is rooted in social recontructionism, aims to eliminate the oppression of one group by another, involve students in democratic decision making, and teach social action and empowerment skills.

Gollnick's (1995) study found that, with few exceptions, state diversity policies in the United States focused on Sleeter and Grant's first three approaches, with little expectation that societal inequities and existing curriculum and classroom practices should actually be reformed to reflect cultural diversity. The scope of diversity policies has also been limited by the federal courts in the United States, which have defined equity in narrow terms. As Welner (2001) notes, ''equity for these federal courts revolves around issues of race and is limited to prevention (or remedy) of intentional discrimination'' (p. 7).

The 1990s were a time of contradiction and contest in the realm of diversity policies in U.S. schools. The 1983 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (*A Nation at Risk*) pronounced that the United States was at risk because of its poor education system. The ensuing emphasis on standards in education resulted in a gradual shift in the discourse on equity. Thus, while the 1994 Amendments to the ESEA contained nine substantial sections addressing diversity and equity, at the state-level campaigns to roll back equity programs such as bilingual education and affirmative action were gaining ground. By the 1990s at least 45 states had at least a minimal multicultural curriculum policy in place. In the United States, policy documents at the state level have generally been limited to guidelines that recommend the inclusion of diverse racial and cultural groups in the curriculum but fail to challenge institutional inequities (Gollnick 1995). The New York State Social Studies Review and Development Committee guidelines were no exception. The six points focused on understanding difference and acknowledging commonalities as an integral part of learning democratic values and building a strong nation (NYSSSRADC 1991).

At the local school district level, as Placier et al. (2000) have noted, efforts to formulate multicultural policy have been reactive and crisis oriented, often arising in response to periods of racial conflict. Highly contentious and fraught with political controversy, efforts to move beyond the policy text to institute practices in schools have often resulted in the ''watering down'' or the abandonment of the original multicultural policy (see, e.g., Agard-Jones 1993; Cornbleth and Waugh 1995; Delpit and Perry 1997). Thus, diversity policies in local U.S. school districts remain more symbol than substance (Johnson 2003).

5.4.5 The Educational Context for Cultural Diversity in Cyprus

Cyprus is an island state in the eastern Mediterranean. It achieved its independence from Britain in 1960, becoming the Republic of Cyprus. The country was divided *de facto* in 1974 after the Turkish invasion of the northern part of the island and a solution is still being sought. At the end of 2006, the estimated population was 867,600

with an ethnic composition of 76.1% Greek Cypriots (including a few Maronites, Armenians, and Latins), 10.2% Turkish Cypriots, and 13.7% immigrants (Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus 2007). These figures do not include Turkish settlers and military personnel, estimated at 150,000 and 40,000, respectively, who have moved into the Turkish-occupied areas since the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974. The constitution of Cyprus recognises Greek and Turkish as the official languages of the Republic. As of May 2004, Cyprus has become a full member of the European Union together with 10 other candidate countries.

The Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC) is responsible for the administration of public education in Cyprus, as well as for the supervision and standardization of services provided by the private sector up to higher education. The public education system in Cyprus is highly centralized, with the MOEC being responsible for the implementation of educational laws and the preparation of new legislation. Public schools are financed from government funds, while private schools raise their funds primarily from tuition and fees along with some government assistance.

In Cyprus, strong democratic and social justice values are emphasized in the aims and objectives of the national educational system:

> The general aim of education in Cyprus is the development of free and democratic citizens…who contribute…to the promotion of cooperation, mutual understanding, respect and love among individuals and people for the prevalence of freedom, justice and peace. (MOEC 2002, p. 17)

The aforementioned aim of education seems to be of paramount importance when one considers the sudden increase in the number of pupils coming from other countries. More specifically, during the last few years, the composition of the population of Cyprus has dramatically changed due to the influx of a significant number of immigrants, mostly coming from the former Soviet Union countries and Asia. The children of these immigrants do not speak Greek as their mother language and are distinguished by the particular cultural features of the ethnic group that they belong to (MOEC 2008a). During the school year 2006–2007, the number of international students has reached 7,775 (MOEC 2008c). These students are distributed across the different levels of education as follows: 660 in pre-primary schools, 3,959 in primary schools, 2,843 in Secondary schools and 313 in Technical schools.

5.4.6 Tensions in Cypriot Key Policy Documents

In light of the demographic changes, the Ministry of Education and Culture (2008b, p. 1) has set the aim of achieving "the smooth integration of all Turkish Cypriot and foreign students to the Cypriot Educational System without any discrimination to any population group". In this context, the MOEC seeks to support the individual characteristics of all pupils instead of assimilating them into the dominant culture (Kanaris 2007; MOEC 2008a). This means that it is vital not only to provide education for learning the Greek language but also to provide the kind of education that supports the language and cultural identity of various groups of pupils. In

response to these demands, the MOEC promotes the implementation of policies and measures that will enhance the smooth integration of pupils from different cultural backgrounds (Kanaris 2007; MOEC 2008a, b). Overall, the approach to diversity by the MOEC may be reflected in the following quote as expressed in the most recent annual report for 2006–2007:

> Developing multicultural awareness, providing information among the pupil population of the way of life, patterns of thought and attitudes of people who differ from us, attempting to understand these differences and communicating with those people are important features of schools. (MOEC 2008a, p. 276)

The ultimate goal is to provide all school members with equal opportunities for learning and thus integrate them successfully into the Cypriot society (Kanaris 2007; Kleanthous 2007).

However, it must be pointed out that until recently the aforementioned declarations of intent were not incorporated into a comprehensive policy framework. For this reason, the MOEC has proceeded to design an institutional framework which addresses the education needs of all students in a holistic way (MOEC 2008b). According to the *Policy Document of the Ministry of Education and Culture on Intercultural Education*, the intercultural approach is adopted as a primary dimension of the Ministry's educational policy. This stance stems from the Ministry's acknowledgement that the intercultural approach is "the most effective educational strategy which can contribute to the acceptance of each other, the cultivation of a climate of trust and the elimination of negative stereotypes and prejudice among students" (MOEC 2008b, p. 1). The philosophy pervading this policy rests upon two main reform-oriented objectives:

1. The creation of a democratic school which integrates but does not exclude.
2. A school system which shows respect for diversity, pluralism (cultural, linguistic, and religious) and multiple intelligences.

Within this policy context, the MOEC promotes the introduction of specific measures in order to speed up the integration of minority students in the school system and society in general:

1. The introduction of parallel classes of accelerated learning of the Greek language.
2. The enhancement of professional development activities for teachers.
3. The development and implementation of an Induction Guide for minority students.
4. Future planning which includes the incorporation of intercultural elements in the curricula and textbooks as well as the production of appropriate educational and training material.

The main tensions that arise from this policy document relate to the operation of the accelerated learning classes. Firstly, the specific measure is only applicable in schools which have a significant number of ethnic minority students and are therefore granted sufficient teaching time over and above what is required in the normal curriculum. This means that the schools with a lower percentage of ethnic minority students are being excluded. However, such a provision is not in congruence with

the document's philosophy of creating democratic schools which do not exclude. In addition, schools are provided with the flexibility to utilize the time in the curriculum of auxiliary subjects (such as Religious Instruction, History, Geography, Physical Education, Music) in order to enhance the accelerated learning schedule. Nevertheless, in this case the students will be deprived of the opportunity to express their cultural identity in subjects which may be considered of lesser value for the majority, such as History and Geography, but which are in fact essential in promoting cultural diversity in the mainstream curriculum. In other words, this dilemma relates to the difficulty in achieving a balance between the promotion of student performance and the adoption of a culturally diverse pedagogy.

5.5 Comparisons Across the Three Policy Contexts

In the USA students do not constitute a homogeneous single language and ethnic population which has become more diverse through increased immigration as in Norway and Cyprus. Instead, particularly in urban schools, students of colour (i.e. African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian American) now represent the majority of students in American public schools. This was true in the ISSPP case study schools as well. Diversity policy in the United States has been largely race-based, with students identified by race on census data as opposed to identified by language (as in the Norwegian case). In practice, diversity issues have largely been decided through litigation, not through legislation. There has also been a long history of legalized segregation in the United States that has been addressed through the courts (e.g. *Brown vs. Board of Education*), but de facto segregation is on the rise in the twenty-first century. This reliance on the courts has recently resulted in equity and diversity initiatives losing ground. For instance, recent Supreme Court cases such *Parents Involved in Community Schools vs. Seattle School District No. 1* (Supreme Court of the United States 2007) have greatly limited the options by which individual school districts can racially integrate their school populations.

Norway has a national policy that addresses cultural and language diversity. Examples from other countries with national policies, such as Canada, indicate that national policies make a difference in the advocacy of and attention to diversity issues (Joshee and Johnson 2005). The United States must rely on state and local diversity policies that are still on the books but had their heyday in the 1980s and early 1990s. Although some local school districts in New York State have written diversity policies, most teachers and administrators are unaware of them.

Another tension in the policy documents, which is evident in both the Norwegian and Cypriot examples, is the focus on the integration of "those who differ from us". However, this notion is juxtaposed to other statements in the policy documents that support cultural, linguistic, and religious pluralism. As such, contradictions both within and across different policy documents can be identified. An "us-them" dichotomy may assume a national culture that is mainly homogeneous, and one in which immigrant students and families are expected to "fit in".

5.6 Examining School Practices Across Three Countries

5.6.1 Norway: Successful School Leadership for Diversity?

The Norwegian ISSPP case studies included schools appointed as "good practice schools" by the Ministry of Education. In this chapter we focus on two of these schools in which approximately 20% of the students were language minorities. *Brage School* is a combined primary and a lower secondary school with about 400 students. The enrolment area includes students from both high and low socio-economic status groups. The staff at Brage School is a heterogeneous group and includes both younger and more experienced teachers, some staff from minority backgrounds, and nearly as many men as women. The principal at Brage is male and was appointed when the school was established 7 years ago. He understands the school's tasks as providing its students with the best possible platform for living in Norway where fluency in the Norwegian language as a communicative tool is key and the school's number one priority. **Skog School** is a primary school with about 350 students. The enrolment area mainly includes students from the average socio-economic status group. The staff at Skog School is mainly a homogenous group made up of female teachers in their fifties. Most of them have worked at the school for a long period of time. The principal at Skog is male and was appointed 7 years ago. He puts focus on the students' history and family background. By explaining and understanding students with reference to their cultural differences and not through a focus on teaching and learning has led some teachers in the school to focus upon students' deficits in relation to the majority culture.

The data from two of the Norwegian ISSPP case study schools was re-analysed through the combination of two complementary theoretical lenses for understanding leadership in diverse schools. These were "culturally responsive leadership" and "leadership for democratic education". An earlier analysis of these two schools (Vedoy and Moller 2007) demonstrated how the deployment of different discourses of diversity, when applied to a study of formal leadership within schools with ethnically diverse populations, can have very different effects in terms of theory and leadership practices. Practices and discourses from the two schools were initially analysed through the lenses of democratic leadership and critical multiculturalism. In particular, the two principals' discourses were compared. In addition, these discourses were viewed in relation to how the whole staff related to each other and students and families from ethnic minority groups within their respective schools. It was argued that the principal played a pivotal role for including all stakeholders in work for democratic schooling (Vedøy and Møller 2007).

At Brage school "respect" was the key term used to describe meetings between majority and minority, or more specifically between people in general. It was shown that the principal, through an explicit discourse of critical multiculturalism based on respect, opened up democratic processes to the development of diversity in his school. This was done through the formulation of shared educational goals and

explicit pedagogy. Moreover, he used language which described ethnic minorities as equals, hired a diverse staff, contributed in the development of a school culture where staff felt free to disagree, expected all teachers to take responsibility for the education of minority students, and expected the whole school to be responsible for the common good and the development of a diverse society.

At Skog school "care" was the key term to describe how the school leaders interacted with minority students and their parents. It was revealed that the principal, through an implicit discourse of pluralism where power relations were taken for granted in favour of the majority and harmony in the staff was stressed, suppressed democratic processes in the development of diversity in his school. This resulted in staff backing off from responsibility concerning minority students, static descriptions of minority groups, and the silencing of teachers who were critical. The concept of "care", in an environment where power relations in general were not disputed, resulted in practices where a focus upon deficits and the preservation of status quo were accepted.

Using the lenses of culturally responsive leadership, it is apparent that the principal at Brage was reluctant when it came to incorporating the history, values, and cultural knowledge of student's home communities in the school curriculum without justification about the pedagogical relevance in each case. His argument was that of respect and individuality, and each student's right to have a say in whether they wanted their home cultures exposed in public or not. In contradiction, the principal at Skog was very much in favour of such a practice; his argument was that such a practice was overall caring and inclusive. The tension between these two attitudes can be explained in the particular situation for minority students in these Norwegian schools. The heterogeneity in the group labelled as minority students is large. At both schools 20% of the student population can be characterized as belonging to ethnic minority groups in a Norwegian context, but these students belong to a number of different language groups and nationalities. The representation of each language group or nationality in the schools is shifting.

The case of developing a critical consciousness among students and staff and empowering parents from diverse communities was genuinely addressed at Brage. This was sought through the use of democratic processes where the distribution of voice and both respect and self-respect was important and through all teachers working to empower minority parents at the individual level by giving extensive information and listening to parents' opinions. At Skog the staff's focus upon the status quo and the present situation seemed to limit the development of a critical consciousness. Work was carried out to help minority parents to adapt to the school's expectations at the individual level but not necessarily to empower them.

In the Norwegian cases the lenses of democratic leadership offered a way to describe and understand whole school practices in the development of a diverse society through respect for processes and individuals. The lenses of culturally responsive leadership, on the other hand, raised the unsettling question of who decides in the matter of incorporating student's home cultures in the school curriculum. Is the matter highly personal for each student or can these practices be generalized in the contexts described?

5.6.2 New York State: Rethinking Successful School Leadership in Challenging U.S. Schools

The U.S. ISSPP case studies involved seven schools in New York State that were selected because they had shown improved student performance since the arrival of the current principal. All but one were high-need schools, reflected in the high percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-fee lunch. The initial study profiled three principals who turned around failing schools serving high-poverty communities in Western New York (Jacobson et al. 2005; Jacobson et al. 2007). These three case studies eventually grew to seven schools which were analysed through Leithwood and Riehl's (2005) conceptual framework derived from three core leadership practices: setting directions, developing people, and redesigning the organization, as well as the enabling principles of accountability, caring, and learning (Giles et al. 2005).

In a subsequent study, data from three of the original U.S. ISSPP schools were reanalysed with a particular focus on home–school relationships (Johnson 2007). The leadership practices in these case study schools are described in this chapter through the lenses of "culturally responsive leadership" and "leadership for democratic education".

Costello Elementary is housed in a modern building in a city neighbourhood surrounded by empty lots and derelict buildings. The student population is racially diverse, with 30% of the students White, 56% African American, 6% Asian American, 5% Hispanic, and 3% Native American. Just over 80% of students at the school are eligible for free and reduced lunch (the primary indicator of poverty status in the United States), a level of economic need that far exceeds the district average (54%).

When the new principal arrived at the school eight years ago, it was her second position as a building-level administrator in this urban district in upstate New York. An African American woman who was raised in the nearby housing projects, she quickly earned a reputation among teachers, support staff and parents in the school as a strong and demanding principal. In her very first "town hall" meetings with staff and students, she established her high expectations that all students "can and will learn".

The second school, *Fraser Academy*, was characterized 10 years ago by high transiency (47.8%), poor attendance, discipline problems, and a school building covered with graffiti and in disrepair. The student population is predominately African American (99%) and largely poor—over 90% of the students qualify for free and reduced lunches. Prior to the arrival of the new principal, the school had great difficulty connecting with and encouraging parents to support the school in its work with students. The dearth of parents at parent meetings, the reluctance of parents to collect report cards, and the sometimes contentious relationships between parents and teachers meant that parents did not feel comfortable and welcome in the school. As one of the veteran teachers noted, "Before [the new principal] got here, we didn't have parents in the school."

The new principal, recruited from a large school district in the Midwest through a partnership with a regional bank, is an African American woman who has a Mas-

ters degree in guidance and counselling and a doctorate in educational administration. Since the beginning of the principal's tenure, the school has risen from being one of the lowest performing schools in its district to one of the highest. In 2001, the school was recognized as one of the most improved schools in New York State for student performance in eighth-grade math, as well as being the most improved school in math that year in the county.

The third school, *Colman Elementary*, is located in a first-ring suburb just outside a large urban district in Western New York. Like many first-ring suburbs adjacent to U.S. cities, the district has become more racially, socially, and economically diverse in recent years, and longtime teachers from Colman note changing family structures in the school as well, with an increase in single-parent families. The school population remains predominately White (94%) and middle class, but the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunches has increased to 16%. The teaching faculty of Colman is entirely white and female, and many have spent the majority of their teaching careers at the school.

When she arrived at this suburban school 7 years ago, this White principal was a veteran administrator in her fifties with 9 years of experience in high-poverty schools in the nearby city school system. She worked at creating a more trusting and supportive environment for both teachers and parents at the school by creating an "open door policy" to make parents feel welcome and facilitate communication between parents and teachers. Colman's principal maintains a core belief that parents should be integrated throughout the school and that both teachers and parents must have a sense of belonging.

Each of the three women principals in these U.S. case study schools—two African American and one White—worked to create a trusting environment in their school where parents and community members could feel welcome and comfortable. At Fraser Elementary School the newly appointed African American principal transformed the school's relationship with parents through an ethic of care and the use of "open door" strategies. In this school, the discourse of "care" could be described as empowering, for the principal made hiring a diverse faculty a priority. These new teachers, along with the principal, identified with parents and held high expectations for student achievement. At Colman Elementary, a predominately white middle-class school with a changing student body, the principal emphasized a sense of belonging and the importance of personal connection with parents. Because racially diverse Costello Elementary had a previous reputation for low student achievement and inconsistent student discipline, the new African American principal's goal was to create a safe and nurturing child-centered learning environment that focused on addressing students' basic social and emotional needs. As one of the parents put it:

> You see (the principal) telling children "You're important. We're glad you're here." ….all the children feel that this school is for them, that they are important here.

All three U.S. principals held high expectations for student achievement. For the two African American women leaders, this "no excuses" approach maps onto a long

historical tradition of high expectations for African American students within the Black community and Black women leaders who are often viewed as community "othermothers" to the children in their schools (Collins 1991). The White suburban principal's approach regarding inclusiveness in home–school relationships seemed related to her moral stance to "serve children and families first". Yet there was little evidence from data collected about their instructional programs that these leaders incorporated students' home cultures or community "funds of knowledge" in the day-to-day curriculum of their schools. Fraser Elementary probably comes the closest to this, with multicultural assemblies, occasional staff development workshops for teachers, and multicultural literature prevalent in the school library.

Through the lenses of leadership for democratic education and critical multiculturalism, the leaders of these three schools represent a continuum of efforts to transform whole school practices in the development of a democratic and diverse society and distribute leadership throughout the organization. Although the United States does not have a comparable tradition of democratic leadership as Norway, each of these principals made efforts to include culturally diverse parents and community members in the life of the school, with Fraser being the most inclusive and Costello being the least inclusive. Faced with safety issues in the surrounding neighbourhood at Fraser Elementary, the principal brought together parents, teachers, and the block club to form an "action group" to pressure city officials and established a "parent patrol" to disrupt the drug dealing in the city park near the school. By modelling agency, Fraser's principal enabled parents to become successful advocates and lobbyists in accessing and mobilizing community resources needed for their neighbourhood. In their words, "from the beginning she's (the principal) included the parents in every decision that's being made around here".

Although Colman's principal initiated workshops for parents and enlisted them as full members of the site-based decision-making team, it is the personal relationships and her advocacy for parents that have made the difference in school–community relationships. As one of the parents described her approach:

> She will listen to you as a parent…she will speak to the teachers on your behalf and get you the support you need. She will get you the help you need, and that's something that's been helpful, kind of a go-between between parents (and teachers).

At Costello Elementary, recognizing that her hard-hitting style could be intimidating to some of the parents, the principal hired a parent liaison and utilized the guidance counsellor in the school to help enlist parents as volunteers and coordinate parent workshops. But there is little evidence that parents were involved in decision making in this school. Of the three U.S. case study schools, none of them involved students in the democratic life of the school.

In the face of high-stakes testing and accountability mandates in U.S. schools, this reanalysis of the ISSPP case study data raises questions about how successful principals in culturally diverse schools might maintain high standards for student success and upward mobility without producing a narrow and standardized curriculum (see, e.g., Sleeter 2006).

5.6.3 Cyprus: Successfully Leading Diversified Rural Schools

The Cyprus findings have emerged through the secondary analysis of the ISSPP data as well as through additional data collected from complementary interviews with the principals of the schools. The selection of the two rural school cases to be examined was based on the existence of a significant percentage of ethnic minority students in the schools as well as evidence from the previous analysis that their principals were indeed successful.

School Cape is one of two primary schools in a village located within the rural areas of the capital of Cyprus. The once small village has experienced shifting demographics on several occasions. After the Turkish invasion of Cyprus more than 30 years ago, a government refugee settlement was established that changed the character of the village. In later years, due to its proximity to the capital, the village attracted many affluent residents. Recently, the industrial area of the village has attracted many immigrant workers. Consequently, most children of the school are Cypriot while 6% of children are from immigrant families.

The principal of the school is male and in his early fifties. He has completed 3 years as a principal at this school and was a teacher for 30 years. The principal viewed school leadership as a challenge which he wanted to achieve and obtained a Master's degree in Educational Leadership to prepare himself for the principalship. This principal coped with the challenges of the school through a combination of his own personal strengths and the experience he gained throughout his career and his education.

School Daphne is located in a small village located within the rural areas of the capital of Cyprus. The moderate SES and the homogeneity of the village population have begun to change due to the recent arrival of immigrant workers. Up until a few years ago, School Daphne served only local children from the local village. Later on, the school was made into a district school and began to accept children from a nearby village as well. More recently, the school has also been accepting immigrant children who currently comprise 16% of the student population.

The school principal is a woman in her fifties who has been a teacher for 33 years, all of which were spent at village schools. This is her first principalship and she has just completed the third year. One of the major challenges faced by the principal has been the racism expressed towards the immigrant students. She considers the main obstacle in the integration of the children in the school to be the resistance of the local community towards immigrant families.

First, the practices and discourses of the two school principals were analysed through the lens of "culturally responsive leadership". At School Cape, the principal seemed to exhibit respect towards all of the children, irrespective of their ethnicity, language, and religion. The principal was committed to the value of human beings in general as well as their right to live among each other without any prejudice. In this way, he aimed at creating an inclusive environment where social inequities would be challenged. This strong will of the principal was realized through the creation of a positive atmosphere in the school where all children would intermingle for various activities.

The principal of School Cape also made an effort to incorporate cultural "funds of knowledge" in the curriculum. For example, all children were invited to display elements of their home culture in religious and cultural school events. Furthermore, immigrant members of the community were invited to talk to the children about the difficulties they encountered upon their arrival in Cyprus. Through these actions, the principal utilized the social capital of the community in order to create an empowering environment for all students and their families. According to the principal:

> What we want to do is to pay attention to the children at all levels of the actions of the school unit without making any attempt to assimilate them, that is make them forget what they used to do. This is important.

To this effect, a multicultural approach was also promoted in the classroom. For example, during religious instruction all children were encouraged to talk about their own experiences concerning religion. The aim was to create an inclusive instructional environment whereby students' home cultures would serve as a vehicle for learning.

With regard to the principal of School Daphne, an "ethic of care" towards the individuality of all children was demonstrated by promoting an inclusive, child-centered learning environment. For instance, ethnic minority students could express themselves in their mother language, sing their own local songs, and bring their own folk tales to class. Furthermore, during the Week of Intercultural Dialogue an exhibition was organized during which the children displayed objects featuring their home culture including books, clothes, and photographs.

Both principals also launched attempts to build stronger connections between the school and the diverse community. In the case of School Cape, the principal kept an "open door policy" regarding parents while he managed to gain the support (both moral and financial) of the parents' association. In addition, he set clear boundaries regarding the interventions of those parents who were in favour of streaming. In this way, he clearly demonstrated his strong advocacy for the more disadvantaged community.

The principal of School Daphne also acknowledged that the local community exhibits great resistance towards the integration of immigrant families. As a result, the principal instigated teachers to subtly promote acceptance of the immigrant children during their interactions with the parents. The principal herself communicated the school goals regarding cultural diversity to the parents' association. However, her approach for empowering the ethnic minority students and parents was not as strong as the advocacy observed in the case of principal Cape.

Comparing the practices of the two principals, it is evident that the principal of School Cape moved a step further than the principal of School Daphne in order to develop a stronger culture of socio-political consciousness within the school. The curriculum adjustments he made were more innovative and he seemed to be more willing to challenge the status quo in order to empower the diverse community of the school, and thus he seemed to be more involved in the creation of a sense of social justice with regards to minorities in his school.

The leadership practices of the principals of both schools were also examined through the lens of "leadership for democratic education". In School Cape, teachers were invited to become actively involved in the process of the development of a diverse society. A shared pedagogy with clear expectations was formed in collaboration with the teaching staff. In addition, the principal utilized the expertise of a teacher who had a Master's degree in Intercultural Education by assigning her the responsibility of coordinating a range of activities aimed at the integration of minority students. Thus, leadership was not centralized in the principal's role but distributed to the rest of the staff as well.

The principal of School Cape also employed democratic processes in order to empower the ethnic minority students in school decision making through participation in the students' council. In one particular situation, the regulations were modified so that a specific child who was very close to be elected could be positioned as an additional representative in the council.

The principal of School Cape could also be distinguished by his willingness to build arenas for collaboration and negotiation with the wider community. More specifically, the ethnic minority parents were often contacted by the principal in order to discuss and resolve any problems which had emerged during the school year. In this way, he provided space for their voices to be heard in a democratic process of decision making. However, not all parents were in a position to help in an effective way, due to language constraints and their long hours of work.

The transformation of organizational structures through the utilization of compensatory education tools has been a priority of the principal of School Cape. To this end, an induction class was created to teach minority students the Greek language, even though the use of induction classes is not officially foreseen. This tool was intended to speed up the achievement of the goal of equal social access by complementing the practices of incorporating the students' home cultures.

With regard to School Daphne, the principal also attempted to build the foundations for collaborative action. In successfully handling the issue of diversity, the principal formed together with the teaching staff a shared vision and set clear expectations for the inclusion of ethnic minority children. To this effect, the principal created committees of teachers who were responsible for forming relevant action plans. Thus, distributed leadership was employed in that teachers took a leading role for the development of a diverse society within the school.

Finally, the principal of school Daphne established frequent and direct communication with the parents of ethnic minority children. For example, in the case of conflicts among students, translated letters were sent to the parents or phone calls made in order to explain the school policy and the school expectations with regards to their children. Some efforts were also made to engage them in the parents association but their response was negative due to their tight working schedules.

Through the lens of "leadership for democratic education" it seems that both principals engaged themselves in the mobilization of school stakeholders towards the creation of a democratic society. However, the principal of school Cape showed greater creativity in managing organizational and cultural structures in his effort to empower the diverse community of the school. In fact, actions such as the formation of induction classes constituted a challenge to the established rules of the Ministry.

5.7 Similarities and Differences Across National Contexts

Cross-national comparisons remind us that theory and practice in educational leadership and management is socially constructed and contextually bound. The difference is even greater when the countries compared do not share a common political and cultural heritage (cf. Johnson et al. 2008). Also, the selection of schools in the ISSPP study allowed for national variety, and as such it is complicated to conduct a robust cross-country analysis (Leithwood 2005). For instance, the three U.S. cases were all defined as "high need" schools located in challenging environments. Accordingly, the principals at these schools had to cope with specific challenges related to poverty, discipline problems, and high-stakes testing. The selection of the rural schools in Cyprus was based on the existence of a significant percentage of ethnic minority students in the schools and evidence of successful principalship, while the Norwegian schools were recognized as "good practice schools" by the Ministry and selected to represent the full range of compulsory schools based on a distinctive background variable. Therefore, our cross-national comparison of efforts to lead for diversity in multiethnic schools will highlight and uncover different challenges for school leaders depending on the context. These challenges include tensions connected to the role of school leaders as catalysts for change, and tensions that may occur between honouring home cultures and promoting student outcomes. Issues about how leadership practices which contribute to the empowerment of all stakeholders should be defined and provided are closely related.

5.7.1 School Leaders as Catalysts for Change

In many studies school leadership is highlighted as the determining variable for whether schools are successful or not with their students, and in particular this is the case for students from diverse backgrounds. These are schools which have the power to move beyond the celebration of diversity in order to transform the school from an organization into a community where all members are respected. The most successful schools have principals that also allow participation of teachers in the work of leadership, use inquiry-based information to inform decision and practice, establish responsibilities that reflect involvement and collaboration, and focus upon and generate high student achievement (Leithwood and Riehl 2005; Reyes and Wagstaff 2005).

Our case studies about leadership for diversity across all three contexts have provided examples of how school leaders are perceived as or expected to be catalysts for change. In all three countries, it is expected that principals apply a highly visible leadership style and have a strong focus on student learning. Strong leadership is needed in order to change schools to become learning organizations.

In a country like the USA with high accountability measures, student performance on external tests of literacy and numeracy has become a key measure of school success. In challenging, high-poverty schools, like the case schools we have

highlighted in this chapter, this often determines whether the school will remain open and the principal will retain his or her job. Nevertheless, the school leaders in our American case study schools managed to take social relationships into account in spite of high-stakes accountability.

In Norway the accountability issue did not involve high-stakes exams and education for citizenship was put to the forefront to a greater extent. Compared to their colleagues in the American context, there is more talk about understandings of learning that acknowledge the whole person, and to create the conditions under which all children can learn well within a socially just and democratic context. However, the meaning of democracy is ambiguous, and there are disagreements about how democratic leadership is defined and should be provided. While the principal at Brage emphasizes intellectual stimulation and language education as the main way to fulfil this mission, the principal at Skog focused on understanding students with reference to their differences in home culture and directed attention to students' deficits in relation to the majority culture. There is a stronger focus on and more explicit talk about improving student outcomes, but viewed from the perspectives of principals themselves, in spite of different leadership strategies, the focus of Norwegian principals is directed towards doing what they think is best for the students. Although external demands for results-driven curricula and other forms of bureaucratic accountability are increasing in the Scandinavian countries, they are not yet at the same level of intensity as that experienced by their American colleagues (Møller 2009). The principals of the Norwegian case study schools seem to have a rather relaxed attitude towards their superiors, and they do not seem to run any risk by this approach. They still have the "option" of paying little attention to managerial accountability.

The same seems to be the case for the school principals in Cyprus, as demonstrated by the principal at School Cape who set clear boundaries regarding the interventions of those parents who were in favour of streaming and in this way demonstrated his strong advocacy for the more marginalized community and for leadership as a moral endeavour.

5.7.2 Honouring Home Cultures and Promoting Student Outcomes

While diversity in American education is an old phenomenon, it occurs as a relatively new challenge for Norwegian and Cypriot education. But all three countries strive for an equitable pluralism that may break down social barriers between students of different backgrounds. Leadership practices which first and foremost put focus on cultural diversity without simultaneously emphasizing academics and intellectual development may approach diversity from a deficit model. For instance, one of the Norwegian case studies demonstrated how a focus on caring for students by emphasizing the difference in student home culture as a key to comprehending the student population brought forward a deficit model of student difference.

Putting focus on the students' history and family background should not be seen as an oppositional goal to promoting student achievement. On the contrary, understanding cultural diversity should be viewed as a prerequisite for promoting student outcomes. A dichotomy between an emphasis on social justice and academics is inappropriate. Developing self-esteem, cultural awareness, and social skills should be closely related to providing intellectual stimulation in a broad sense. However, too often definitions of intellectual development are tied exclusively to standardized scores on tests that fail to incorporate diverse cultural knowledge. Such a narrow conception of learning legitimizes images of success that privilege certain social groups while marginalizing others (Furman and Shields 2005).

In societies such as Norway and Cyprus that have more recently experienced an influx of immigrants and refugees from several ethnic and language groups, principals who are part of the mainstream are challenged to find ways to make the mainstream curriculum and language explicit while also incorporating students' home cultures. In contrast, in the USA because the two predominately African American schools could face closure under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), these African American principals made raising student achievement on standardized tests a priority.

5.8 Conclusion

This chapter aimed at exploring and comparing how successful leadership for diversity is defined and addressed in Norway, Cyprus, and the United States. The analysis of the differences in the ISSPP case study schools across three national contexts underscores the role of varying ideological orientations and policy contexts on the day-to-day practice of successful principals. Successful school leaders must be highly sensitive to their own local and national contexts.

First, there are differences in policy frameworks. Norway and Cyprus have developed national policies that address cultural and language diversity. However, contradictions within and across different policy documents can be identified. For instance, the major educational policy in Norway emphasizes the importance of both democracy and diversity, and the strong commitment to comprehensive education and social justice is underpinned by social democratic politics for promoting equity. Still within the Norwegian policy documents this notion is juxtaposed to other statements with a focus on the integration of those who differ from the majority and may take for granted that immigrant students are expected to "fit in". In the United States diversity policy has been largely race-based as opposed to identified by language or ethnicity, and there is an absence of a national policy framework that promotes cultural pluralism. Although some local school districts in New York State have written diversity policies, most teachers and administrators are unaware of them. Diversity issues have largely been decided through litigation, not through legislation as in Norway and Cyprus.

Second, there are differences in leadership practices across local schools within the same national context as well as across national contexts. The two Norwegian

school principals both work for a democratic and inclusive schooling for minority students, but they interpret what is best for their students quite differently. The Norwegian cases demonstrated how the concept of care, in an environment where power relations in general were not disputed, could result in practices where a focus upon deficits and the preservation of the status quo were accepted. It reminds us of differences related to more individual qualities of school principals. Also, the advocate role for principals may not be so crucial everywhere, but in economically disadvantaged communities, like the contexts of the U.S. schools and the two Cypriot cases, it seems essential. These cases exemplify how principals may demonstrate strong advocacy for parents and communities who have been marginalized.

Third, we need to examine and interrogate the taken-for-granted constructs that underlie empirical data. This can be done through analysing the concrete implications for practice that flow from one principal's adoption of a caring discourse in regard to students. Leadership for diversity discourses and practices are a set of processes rather than something given, and therefore self-reflexivity is demanded, and in particular in terms of foregrounding notions of power (cf. Wilkinson 2008).

Our analysis of the culturally responsive practices in the ISSPP case studies raises questions about what constitutes successful leadership for diversity across contexts. In the face of different national policy contexts, traditions, and accountability pressures, our case studies have demonstrated how issues regarding leadership practices which contribute to the empowerment of all stakeholders created tensions for culturally diverse schools. Is success about increasing student achievement in the mainstream curriculum? Or should we also consider how schools provide learning experiences that "center" students in the history and culture of their families and home communities and provide all students in the school with a multicultural curriculum? Is the leadership aim to integrate immigrant students and parents into the cultural and linguistic mainstream with the hope of greater social mobility in society? Or do successful school leaders also find ways to challenge inequities in the school district and larger society? It raises dilemmas of sameness versus difference and the responsibility for community versus individual freedom. Finding a balance between honouring student home cultures and emphasizing student learning does not easily lend itself to normative models and quick fixes.

References

Agard-Jones, L. (1993). Going over the rainbow curriculum for multicultural education. *Multicultural Education, 1*(38), 13–15.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2006). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (6th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Baumann, G. (1999). *The multicultural riddle: Rethinking national, ethnic, and religious identities.* New York: Routledge.

Castles, S. (2005). Migration, citizenship, and education. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 17–48). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Collins, P. H. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* New York: Routledge.
Cornbleth, C., & Waugh, D. (1995). *The great speckled bird: Education policy-in-the-making.* New York: St. Martin's Press.
Delpit, L., & Perry, T. (Eds.). (1997). The real ebonics debate. *Rethinking Schools, 12*(1). Accessed at: http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/12_01/ebintro.shtml.
Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press.
Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Seabury Press.
Furman, G., & Shields, C. (2005). How can leaders promote and support social justice and democratic community in schools? In W. A. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 119–138). New York: Teachers College Press.
Furman, G., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). Leadership for democratic community in schools. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 105–134). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Giles, C., Johnson, L., Brooks, S., & Jacobson, S. (2005). Building bridges, building community: Transformational leadership in a challenging urban context. *Journal of School Leadership, 15*(5), 519–545.
Gollnick, D. M. (1995). National and state initiatives for multicultural education. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 44–64). New York: Macmillan.
Jacobson, S., Johnson, L., Giles, C., & Ylimaki, R. (2005). Successful leadership in U.S. schools: Enabling principles, enabling schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 607–618.
Jacobson, S., Brooks, S., Giles, C., Johnson, L., & Ylimaki, R. (2007). Successful leadership in three high poverty urban elementary schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(4), 291–317.
Johnson, L. (2002). "Making democracy real": Teacher union and community activism to promote diversity in the New York City Schools—1935–1950. *Urban Education, 37,* 566–587.
Johnson, L. (2003). Multicultural policy as social activism: Redefining who counts in multicultural education. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 6*(2), 107–121.
Johnson, L. (2006). "Making her community a better place to live": Culturally responsive urban school leadership in historical perspective. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5*(1), 19–37.
Johnson, L. (2007). Rethinking successful school leadership in challenging U.S. schools: Culturally responsive practices in school-community relationships. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 49–58.
Johnson, L., Møller, J., Jacobson, S., & Wong, K. C. (2008). Cross-national comparisons in the International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP): The United States, Norway and China. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 52*(4), 407–422.
Joshee, R., & Johnson, L. (2005). Multicultural education in the United States and Canada: The importance of national policy. In N. Bascia, A. Cumming, A. Datnow, K. Leithwood, & D. Livingstone (Eds.), *International handbook on educational policy* (pp. 53–74). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (1999). Multicultural education: Transforming the mainstream. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 245–276). London: Falmer.
Kanaris, A. (2007). Policy of the Ministry of Education and Culture on intercultural education. www.proodeftiki.info/pdfs/presentation3.ppt (in Greek). Accessed 12 July 2008.
Kleanthous, A. (2007, March). *Address of the Minister of Education and Culture of Cyprus. First educational conference of the Pancyprian association of Greek teachers with the title "Reception of children with immigrant origins: The role of the school".* Larnaca: Cyprus.
Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of apartheid schooling in America.* New York: Crown.
Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491.
Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34*(3), 159–165.

Larson, C., & Murtadha, K. (2002). Leadership for social justice. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century; 101st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 134–161). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leithwood, K. (2005). Understanding successful principal leadership: Progress on a broken front. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 619–629.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2005). What do we already know about educational leadership? In W. A. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 12–27). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (Eds.). (1998). *Narrative research: Reading analysis and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). (2002). *Primary education curriculum.* Nicosia: Curriculum Development Service.

Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). (2008a). *Annual report 2007.* www.moec.gov.cy/etisia-ekthesi/pdf/annual_report_2007_en.pdf. Accessed 8 July 2008.

Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). (2008b). *Strategic planning for education*. *The comprehensive revision of our educational system.* http://www.moec.gov.cy/stratigikoi_sxediasmoi/pdf/17_1_2008_stratigikos_shediasmos_anatheorimenos.pdf (in Greek). Accessed 21 June 2007.

Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC). (2008c). *Primary education intercultural education.* www.moec.gov.cy/dde/diapolitismiki.html (in Greek). Accessed 7 July 2008.

Ministry of Education and Research. (2006). *National curriculum for knowledge promotion in primary and secondary education and training*. Oslo: In-house publication.

Møller, J. (2002). Democratic leadership in an age of managerial accountability. *Improving Schools, 5*(2), 11–21.

Møller, J. (2006). Democratic schooling in Norway: Implications for leadership in practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5*(1), 53–69.

Møller, J. (2009). Approaches to school leadership in Scandinavia. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 41*(2), 165–177.

Møller, J., Sivesind, K., Skedsmo, G., & Aas, M. (2006). Skolelederundersøkelsen 2005. Om arbeidsforhold, evalueringspraksis og ledelse i skolen. [Country Survey of School Principalship 2005] *Acta Didactica, 1*, 53–61.

New York City Board of Education. (1989). *Statement of policy on multicultural education and promotion of positive intergroup relations*. New York: New York City Board of Education.

New York State Social Studies Review and Development Committee. (1991). *One nation, many peoples: A declaration of cultural interdependence*. New York: Author.

Orfield, G., Frankenberg, E., & Lee, C. (2002). The resurgence of school segregation. *Educational Leadership, 60*(4), 16–20.

Placier, M., Hall, P. M., McKendall, S. B., & Cockrell, K. S. (2000). Policy as the transformation of intentions: Making multicultural education policy. *Educational Policy, 14*(2), 259–289.

Prewitt, K. (2002). Demography, diversity, and democracy: The 2000 census story. *The Brookings Review, 20*(1), 6–9.

Rebell, M. (2005). Court-ordered reform of New York State school aid. In L. Johnson, M. E. Finn, & R. Lewis (Eds.), *Urban education with an attitude* (pp. 33–40). Albany: SUNY Press.

Reitzug, U. C., & Patterson, J. (1998) "I'm not going to lose you!" Empowerment through caring in an urban principal's practice with students. *Urban Education, 33*(2), 150–181.

Reyes, P., & Wagstaff, L. (2005). How does leadership promote successful teaching and learning for diverse students? In W. A. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 101–118). New York: Teachers College Press.

Riehl, C. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse learners: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 55–81.

Scheurich, J. (1998). Highly successful and loving, public elementary schools populated mainly by low SES children of color: Core beliefs and cultural characteristics. *Urban Education, 33*(4), 451–491.

Sleeter, C. E. (2006). *Un-standardizing curriculum: Multicultural teaching in the standards-based classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sleeter, C. E., & Grant, C. A. (2009). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, & gender* (6th ed.). New York: Wiley.

SSB (2006): *Samfunnsspeilet nr. 4.* Oslo, Statistics Norway.

Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus. (2007). *Statistics of education 2005/2006.* http://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/cystat/statistics.nsf/index_gr/index_gr?OpenDocument. Accessed 10 October 2007.

Supreme Court of the United States (2007). *Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1,* (551 U.S. 05908).

Vedøy, G., & Møller, J. (2007): Successful school leadership for diversity? Examining two contrasting examples of working for democracy in Norway. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 58–67.

Welner, K. G. (2001). *Legal rights, local wrongs: When community control collides with educational equity*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wilkinson, J. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: A critical examination of diversity and educational leadership scholarship. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 40*(2), 101–112.

Woods, P. (2005). *Democratic leadership in education*. London: Chapman.

Chapter 6
Preparing School Leaders to Lead Organizational Learning and Capacity Building

Stephen L. Jacobson, Olof Johansson and Christopher Day

In Chaps. 3–5 of this book the findings make it apparent that the principals successfully influenced student achievement and school effectiveness through their abilities to build organizational learning, capacity, instructional improvement and sensitivity to cultural differences. Such findings beg the question, "Where did these principals learn and hone the skills necessary to be successful?" Although the protocols of the study did not explicitly examine the formal pre- and in-service preparation of our subjects, interviews with the school leaders, teachers and others provided insights into how their leadership skills emerged and evolved. Moreover, our study revealed dispositions, characteristics and practices common to many of these successful school leaders. Therefore, in this chapter and the two that follow, the authors consider how the key knowledge and skills these individuals exhibit can be introduced and utilized to improve the preparation of future and current school leaders.

The need to improve the quality of school leadership has become a focus of educational policymakers worldwide. Over the past decade, millions of dollars have been spent by a variety of sources in the United States alone, including the Department of Education, numerous state education departments and major foundations such as the Wallace Foundation, to better understand and improve the preparation and practice of school leaders. Such investments are mirrored in many other countries, in England, for example, a government-funded National College for School Leadership (NCSL) provides training and development of leaders at all levels against a national standards-based agenda, as well as commissioning a range of research and development projects.

This interest was sparked by two central conclusions about successful school leadership drawn from reviews of the extant research: (1) schools with high-quality leadership tend to outperform schools without it; and, (2) high-quality leadership is especially important in schools facing the greatest challenges (Leithwood and Riehl 2003).

S. L. Jacobson (✉)
University at Buffalo, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY, USA
e-mail: eoakiml@buffalo.edu

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5_6, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

Concurrent with this growing interest in leadership, leadership preparation and the effects of leadership on the performance of schools and student achievement, is the perception that high-quality educational leadership is in relatively short supply. Concerns about shortages in school leadership have emerged in numerous countries, including Australia, Canada, England, Wales and the United States, to name just a few (Jacobson 2005; James and Whiting 1998; Mulford 2003; Williams 2001).

Among the reasons identified for a decline in interest in aspiring school leaders include long hours, budget cuts, overcrowding, a shortage of qualified teachers, an unsupportive external environment, governmental mandates sometimes seen as unnecessary, time fragmentation that does not allow for professional reflection and family life, difficulties of working with children living in poverty who do not have adequate health care, "the pressures of unrelenting change which is not necessarily to education's advantage" and, "the perception that education has become a economic/political football in which the principalship is not valued" (Mulford 2003, pp. 30–31). Additional disincentives include in some countries, but not all (notably the UK), a narrowing differential between teacher and administrator salaries, work-related stress caused by an expansion of role responsibilities, greater public scrutiny, increased accountability for school and student performance and legislative mandates that are under funded or not funded at all (Copland 2001; Kimball and Sirotnik 2000; Supovitz 2000).

In order to address the issue of improving leadership preparation, thus producing more high-quality school leaders, we start this chapter by first examining current approaches to school leadership preparation in the United States, England and Sweden. Next we consider how the findings reported in Chap. 3 about principals successfully leading organizational learning and capacity building could be woven into the fabric of school leadership preparation. We believe that if school leaders are better prepared and supported they are likely to be more effective on the job and many of the disincentives noted above can be abated, particularly stress-related aspects of the role, thus making the role more appealing.

6.1 The Preparation of School Leaders in the United States of America

To understand how school leaders are prepared and certified in the United States, we must restate three elements of American public education first presented in Chap. 1:

1. Educational governance and policymaking in the United States are highly decentralized and, as a consequence, professional educator preparation and certification requirements are determined at the state level, while employment, remuneration and allocation of human resources in public education are determined locally by school districts.
2. The roles and responsibilities of teachers and administrators are bifurcated and their respective preparation and certification requirements are similarly differ-

entiated. Whilst most US principals have prior teacher preparation, certification and experience, few ever teach or return to the classroom once they obtain an administrative position. In fact, the supervisory functions of administrators in many states make their work managerial/confidential, thus precluding their continued participation as members of a teacher union (although they may organize within a separate administrator union).

3. Formal pre-service preparation for aspiring school leaders has a very long history in the United States, with the first university courses on school administration appearing in the late nineteenth century and the first formal training programs in the early twentieth century (Brundrett 2001). In other words, American education has long been based on the premise that administrators should come from the teaching ranks, but that teachers need formal preparation in managerial/supervisory skills before they can become administrators.

Taken together, these three contextual factors reveal the complexity of examining school leadership preparation in the United States. With over 500 preparation programs nationwide and 51 sets of state requirements at the present time (including the District of Columbia), there are a plethora of certification and preparatory models that can be considered. Therefore, to sharpen the focus of this chapter we describe primarily the certification requirements of New York (from where our US cases were drawn), and one innovative program in that state, the Leadership Initiative For Tomorrow's Schools (LIFTS) administrator preparation program of the Graduate School of Education at the University at Buffalo (UB), where the US research team was located.

Before examining New York's statutory requirements and the curricula design of the LIFTS program, we first describe briefly the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards, a set of performance standards for educational leadership that was developed and revised over the past decade and a half with the express purpose of improving school leadership preparation, certification and practice across the United States.

6.1.1 Standards for Educational Leadership in the USA

The ISLLC Standards were first developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers in 1996 and then revised in 2007 in collaboration with the National Policy Board on Educational Administration (NPBEA).[1] ISLLC is built around six performance standards, each beginning with the same stem phrase, "A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by…". The

[1] Details about the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 as adopted by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration on December 12, 2007 can be found at: http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/elps_isllc2008.pdf.

stem reflects the intentionality underlying No Child Left Behind (NCLB) federal legislation followed by a set of actions that define that standard. Specifically:

Standard 1: Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.
Standard 2: Advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
Standard 3: Ensuring management of the organization, operations and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
Standard 4: Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
Standard 5: Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
Standard 6: Understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Each standard is then followed by a set of functions that give it form. For example, Standard 1 requires school leaders to:

(a) collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission;
(b) collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness and promote organizational learning;
(c) create and implement plans to achieve goals;
(d) promote continuous and sustainable improvement;
(e) monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans.

Since its inception, ISLLC has been adopted by 35 states to provide a more standardized accreditation and accountability regime for school leadership preparation programs and administrator certification requirements. New York State, exercising its right to self-control, is currently not one of them, although at the time of this writing in spring 2010, the State's new Commissioner of Education, David Steiner, has proposed adoption of the ISLLC Standards.

6.1.2 Standards for Educational Leadership in New York State

New York has long been known for having among the most rigorous certification requirements in the United States, with a minimum of 60 graduate credits beyond the baccalaureate required for an administrator certification. In order to stay abreast of the ISLLC movement, Richard Mills, who was then New York's Commissioner of Education, empowered a Blue Ribbon Panel on School Leadership to identify the essential knowledge and skills for effective school leadership, and in 2001, they developed the following list:

1. Leaders know and understand what it means and what it takes to be a leader.
2. Leaders have a vision for schools that they constantly share and promote.

3. Leaders communicate clearly and effectively.
4. Leaders collaborate and cooperate with others.
5. Leaders persevere and take the "long view".
6. Leaders support, develop and nurture staff.
7. Leaders hold themselves and others responsible and accountable.
8. Leaders never stop learning and honing their skills.
9. Leaders have the courage to take informed risks.

Based on these nine standards, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) generated new regulations for the preparation, certification and examination of school leaders in 2004, and over 50 preparation programs statewide, including LIFTS, revamped their curricula accordingly. NYSED's espoused goal was to ensure that all pre-service preparation programs become outcome-based, theory-driven, internally coherent and integrated, focused on teaching and learning, and grounded with an intensive clinical experience. Approved programs could then prepare administrators for any or all of three administrator certifications: (1) School Building Leader (SBL)—building-level positions up to the principal; (2) School District Leader (SDL)—district-level positions up to the superintendent; (3) School District Business Leaders (SDBL)—district business office positions up to the assistant or associate superintendent. Note that these certificates focus on an individual's level of organizational responsibility, i.e. building, district or business office, as opposed to specific role functions such as principal or superintendent as is the case in many other states.

To become a certified administrator in New York, an individual must complete a state-approved program (typically 30–36 graduate credit hours beyond a masters degree) and then successfully pass the State test specifically designed for one of the three certification areas listed above. All three tests are based upon and aligned with the State's nine essential knowledge and skills for effective school leadership.[2]

6.1.3 Caveats About Standards

Professional standard setting has proven to be a valuable activity for advancing national and state conversations around improving the quality of school leadership preparation, but taken alone it was insufficient. In order to reconfigure programs to improve how they go about developing and assessing future educational leaders, many argued that a research agenda had to be developed that would map backwards from positive leadership–learning relationships to contributing preparation format (Doolittle et al. 2003). To that end, a Stanford University study (Darling-Hammond et al. 2007) examined best practices in leadership development and found statis-

[2] Details about these tests can be found at:
http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/PDFs/NYELA_TestDesign_Frameworks_100-101.pdf
http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/PDFs/NYELA_TestDesign_Frameworks_103-104.pdf
http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/PDFs/NYELA_TestDesign_Frameworks_105-106.pdf

tically significant differences between graduates of exemplary leader preparation programs and those from more typical programs. Common features found in the exemplary pre-service programs studied were:

- A comprehensive and coherent curriculum aligned with state and professional standards, in particular the ISSLC standards, which emphasize instructional leadership.
- A philosophy and curriculum emphasizing instructional leadership and school improvement.
- Active, student-centred instruction that integrates theory and practice and stimulates reflection. Instructional strategies include problem-based learning, action research, field-based projects, journal writing, and portfolios that feature substantial use of feedback and assessment by peers, faculty and the candidates themselves.
- Faculties who are knowledgeable in their subject areas, including both university professors and practitioners experienced in school administration.
- Social and professional support in the form of a cohort structure and formalized mentoring and advising by expert principals.
- Vigorous, targeted recruitment and selection to seek out expert teachers with leadership potential.
- Well-designed and supervised administrative internships that allow candidates to engage in leadership responsibilities or substantial periods of time under the tutelage of expert veterans (Darling-Hammond et al. 2007, Executive summary, p. 6).

Looking more specifically at the recruitment and selection of high-quality candidates, Darling-Hammond's research team recommended that: (1) candidates be excellent teachers with strong instructional backgrounds and demonstrable leadership abilities; (2) recruitment should involve proactive outreach to these desired candidates; (3) selection include a variety of data from a variety of sources, not just transcripts and grade point averages; (4) district partners be engaged to identify high-quality candidates and develop district support; and (5) recruitment and selection processes reflect the program's definition of effective leadership and be aligned with professional standards for school leadership.[3]

As we will show, a careful crosswalk between the findings of the Stanford study (2007) and the program design of LIFTS reveals a tight alignment between the study's identified exemplary practices, particularly with regard to recruitment and selection, and the content and processes of LIFTS. LIFTS represents one university's attempt to combine a well-articulated set of standards for high-quality educational leadership certification and performance with a thoughtfully designed preparation program intended to help aspiring administrators meet those standards.

[3] Complete details of this report can be found out:
http://www.ucea.org/storage/pdf/UCEA_Policy_Brief_fall_07.pdf and
http://www.wallacefoundation.org/wallace/preparingschoolleader.pdf.

6.1.4 The Leadership Initiative for Tomorrow's Schools

The LIFTS program is a 36-credit hour, 2-year program (including summers) that combines intensive coursework with a minimum of 600 hours of practical administrative internship experience. Although the internship can be done on a part-time basis over the course of the program, ideally it is an intensive 15-week, full-time (40 hours per week) assignment. LIFTS was originally designed in the early 1990s and subsequently revised based upon best-practice research on school leadership and the New York standards listed above. It has subsequently been recognized as one of the most innovative programs in the United States (UCEA Review 2008).

To be admitted for the SBL or SDL certification, LIFTS applicants must hold a Master's degree in an area functionally related to their teaching (e.g. science or special education), permanent teacher certification (or state certification as a school counsellor, psychologist, or social worker) and 3 years of successful teaching or equivalent experience in schools. Candidates for the SDBL certificate need not have been a teacher and their Masters degree is typically from a more business-related program, such as a Masters in Business or Public Administration.

Successful applicants must have demonstrated leadership potential, both in and outside of schools; effective oral and written communication skills; the ability to work in collegial cohort groups and an insightful understanding of teaching, learning and the educational enterprise. In addition to transcripts of prior coursework, letters of recommendations and a writing sample, 2–3 person teams of academics and field practitioners interview each of the top candidates and typically 12–20 students are selected to be in a 2-year LIFTS cohort. The interviews are intended to verify the information found in the written documents, to determine a candidate's willingness to commit to a rigorous 2-year program and get a sense of their "goodness of fit" with a cohort model that emphasizes collaborative and collective leadership.

Once selected, candidates engage in the following key design features:

- Study in cohort groups that build a community of inquiry and foster an understanding of collective leadership.
- An integrated curriculum organized around real problems of practice, e.g. to better understand the impact of context on leadership practice a recent cohort developed a comparative study based on site visits to three schools: an urban elementary school, a rural middle school and a suburban high school. The current cohort is developing a policy option brief for an area high school seeking to improve student performance, relative to similar schools in Western New York, in a cost-effective manner.
- Completion of an intensive, field-based component involving clinical internships of no less than 600 hours.
- Mentoring by an experienced school leader, often a LIFTS alumni, who serves throughout duration of the program.

In order to develop the essential knowledge and skills for effective school leadership as defined and then tested by NYSED for certification, the LIFTS program is committed to helping its cohort members:

- articulate and clarify their educational beliefs, values and visions;
- focus on the teaching–learning process in order to develop their ability to lead instructional teams;
- encourage and demonstrate risk-taking and flexibility;
- encourage and demonstrate an appreciation for diversity and a commitment to equity;
- employ critical reflection and thoughtful inquiry as constant components of practice;
- act in ways that are informed by the outcomes of systematic inquiry and moral deliberation;
- understand and facilitate a change process for creating and implementing a collective vision of school improvement;
- promote the involvement of the wider community in education;
- develop professional and personal support systems and networks.[4]

Since its first graduating cohort in 1996, LIFTS has placed almost 180 aspiring leaders into the field and almost 95% have been hired as school administrators, ranging from principals and assistant principals at the building level to superintendents, assistant superintendents and directors at the district level. One must remember that in the United States, this is a very competitive market place since each district makes its own hiring decisions and that there are seven administrator preparation programs in Western New York alone (with LIFTS being the smallest such program). In other words, graduates of the LIFTS program seem to have the leadership knowledge and skills that area school districts are seeking and the desire to take on those challenging roles.

Before trying to connect the aspects of LIFTS that might be useful in developing the ability of school leaders to lead organizational learning and capacity building, we next examine leadership preparation in England.

6.2 Leadership Training and Development in England

As noted earlier, the fact that the recruitment, training and development and retention of high-quality school leaders has become a priority for educational policy makers internationally is testament to the recognition that effective school leadership, and principalship in particular, is essential in order to raise standards of education for all students and produce a socially responsible and healthy citizenry. England is one of four of 22 OECD countries to provide pre-service, in-

[4] More details about the LIFTS program can be found at: http://gse.buffalo.edu/programs/edadmin/lifts.

duction and in-service leadership training (OECD 2008, p. 109). What is noticeable, however, is that the role played by universities in leadership training and development has been marginalized by the government with the establishment of a National College for the Leadership of Schools and Children's Services. In effect, it is now a government-led "policy into practice" based agenda that dominates training and development. Credentialing in the academic sense is not a priority.

The origins of a national system for the training and development of school leaders may be traced to 1983 when the then Department of Education and Science issued Circular 3/83 through which it made funding available to local authorities (school districts) for the management training of heads and other senior teachers in primary and secondary schools. In that year a modestly funded "National Development Centre for School Management Training" (NDC) was established in Bristol University. Its brief was:

> To improve the provision and effectiveness of management training for head teachers and senior staff…in schools [and] to equip heads and senior staff with the practical skills, knowledge and attitudes needed to enable them to manage and develop their schools as effective institutions for pupils' learning.

The training itself was to take place in regional centres throughout the country and there were two types of courses; one term (semester) full-time training opportunities for experienced leaders; and 20-day "basic courses". Essentially, these programs were non-accredited and delivered through universities in close partnerships with local authorities. There was little pre-course preparation or post course support, yet within a year there were 32 "providers", 100 one-term training courses and 1,600 basic courses. Local authorities began to take ownership of the provision of what was then called "management" training, either through establishing specialist advisory posts or, through consortia arrangements, their own management training centres. The NDC in Bristol became the quality assurance and evaluation filter for these, in a sense playing a brokerage role between central and local government and later, industry, as it too began to contribute its experience and expertise. It is worth noting that action learning, action research and practice-based inquiry was a central feature of the management courses as it is today.

These innovative school—district—university partnerships ended 4 years later as government policy to disperse in-service funding directly to schools rather than channel it through local authorities constrained their ability to support of full-time, in-service training and development of teachers in universities. In effect, the new regulations, "changed the locus of the training experience increasingly from the providing institution to the teachers' centre, the LEA or the school" (Poster 1988, p. 21).

It is not the intention of this section to retrace the history of leadership and management provision in England in its entirety. However, in fast forwarding to the twenty-first century, it is important to examine its origins. Acknowledgement of the importance of school leadership training is not new. What is new is its alignment with other national "performativity" and results-driven policies of standardization and accountability. These policies have attempted to implement root and branch

reform in schools, health and social services in the name of raising standards and increasing equity (the social inclusion agenda).

6.2.1 Standards-Based Leadership and Management Training

> After years of work on structural changes—standards and testing and ways of building students and schools accountable—the educational policy world has turned its attention to the people charged with making the system work. At the classroom level, that has meant a flurry of efforts to attract and train good teachers and keep them in their jobs. But nowhere is the focus on the human element in publish education more prevalent than in the renewed recognition of the importance of strong and effective leadership. (Olson 2000)

This statement, taken from an American publication, is equally applicable to the UK, which has moved from a position pre-2000 when there was an uncertain smorgasbord of largely local and occasionally regional non-accredited training and development provided by local authorities (school districts) and university provided masters degree level programs. At that time it was not deemed necessary to provide formal training for leadership roles in schools. Then, as now, school principals did not need to hold a degree in what, in the USA would be termed "educational administration" in order to qualify for the role. At that time also, however, schools in England and Wales had already experienced a plethora of government-inspired reforms. There was a national curriculum, regular independent inspections of schools, a target-driven imperatives for schools to improve their students' performance at key stages of their education (7 years, 11 years, 14 years, 16 years, 17 years and 18 years). The media had begun to create public "league tables" of results, enabling parents to differentiate between the good, the bad and the ugly. Teachers' salaries had increased in the face of problems of recruitment and retention, and principals' salaries had increased even more. By 2002–2003, principals in English secondary schools topped the OECD league in absolute terms and in terms of the relative increase against the salaries of teachers. Their maximum is now twice as high as that of teachers (OECD 2008, p. 173).

6.2.2 The National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services

The creation of NCSL in England in 2000 signalled the Labour government's determination to develop and accredit national programs for school leaders at all levels. The College's programs now dominate the training and development programs for leaders in English schools. In 2008, its remit was extended to include the training and development of Directors of Children's Services and, in 2009, it was re-named the National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services.

The establishment of the College was a clear sign that: (i) the government recognized that for its reforms to be implemented in schools required high levels of compliance and commitment. Someone—the principal—had to be both offered support and held responsible and accountable; (ii) the complexity and quantity of the reforms themselves needed managing at the point of implementation.

The National College for School Leadership and Children's Services, established in 2000 as the lead non-departmental public body (aka quango), is at the heart of national policy initiatives intended to increase the supply, quality, succession and standards of all school leaders. Its goals are to:

i. Inspire new leaders: identifying, inspiring and developing future leaders to sustain the supply of talent
ii. Provide great leadership development: giving all leaders the expertise they need to become great leaders by providing guidance and support tailored to individual needs, access to knowledge and resources, and unrivalled leadership development and networking opportunities
iii. Empowering successful leaders: harnessing the expertise of the best leaders to drive improvement beyond their own schools and organization
iv. Shaping future leadership: supporting leaders to adapt the way they work to meet changing demands, influencing policy and advising government (NCSL 2009)

It is not possible to do justice to the breadth of programs now offered to school leaders at all levels by this government quango. They are many and varied and closely tied to the government insistence to ensure a career route for teachers and head teachers that matches its own policies (for example, to develop "executive heads" of federations of schools and "consultant" heads who may assist in the improvement of schools which are deemed to be "failing", and "national leaders of education" who are head judged to have built and sustained excellent schools and who may be used by those who have not in a variety of ways).

More recently, the government has responded to the likely age-related retirement of many principals (over 60% were aged 50+ years in 2006/2007) by promoting succession planning and accelerated leadership routes.

The three more formal "accredited" programs named here are closely tied, also, to the government's "national standards" framework of competencies for teachers and school leaders, developed by another "quango", the "Teacher Development Agency", i.e. the "National Professional Qualification for Headship" (NPQH); "Leading from the Middle" (LFTM); and the Leadership Programme for Serving Head teachers (LPSH).

In 1997 the government introduced the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) aimed at those senior leaders in schools who aspired to headship. The NPQH

> …is a practical professional qualification firmly rooted in school improvement, which prepares senior teachers and aspiring heads for headship. The programme offers challenging and relevant training including on-line learning, school-based assessment and visits to successful schools.

Initial take up was low, but increased dramatically in 2004 when it was announced that by 2009 the NPQH qualification (accredited by NCSL) would become a man-

datory precondition for applications for headship. This was quickly followed by the development of the Leadership Programme for Serving Heads (LPSP) and, more recently, "Leading from the Middle", a program for the high numbers of teachers who hold responsibility posts for leading others but who are not yet members of the relatively small coteries of senior leadership teams (SLTs) in English schools which usually consist of the head, deputy head(s), assistant head(s) and between two and four other senior staff.

The growth of national programs of leadership training and development in England can be seen, therefore, to have been concurrent with the application of the standards agenda to leadership and aligned to policies intended to secure succession planning. In effect, the NCSL's provision of these and other programs provides a career development ladder for leaders (NCSL 2009, p. 12):

- Emergent leadership: when a teacher is beginning to take on management and leadership responsibilities
- Established leadership: assistant and deputy heads who do not intend to apply for headship
- Entry to leadership, including preparation for and induction into this post
- Advanced leadership: in which leaders refresh and update skills
- Consultant leadership: for experienced, able leaders who take on training, mentoring, inspection or other experiences outside their own school

Local authorities (school districts) themselves deliver a range of formal and informal leadership and management training, development and networking opportunities and because of their own personnel structures and proximity to the schools themselves, can and do provide a close monitoring function that a national organization cannot. Universities remain the traditional providers of accredited Postdoctoral Diploma, MA, MBA and EdD programs in Leadership and Management and most now allow accreditation of prior learning and achievement of the more substantive National College programs (NPQH, LPSH, LFTM). Nevertheless, these remain a minority for school leaders, in part because of their cost and in part because the quasi qualifications offered by the National College enables them to progress their careers without the necessity of the kinds of sustained, critical intellectual engagement required by universities. Whether the predominant operationally oriented mode of National College programs will entirely replace the more critically reflective, research informed programs offered by universities remains an open question.

Despite its close links to government, which causes some head teachers and academics to be sceptical about its ability to produce research and programs that are independent, there can be no doubt that the establishment of the College, on the University of Nottingham campus, has transformed the number and quality of opportunities for the education of school leaders at all levels. What is interesting is that the models of program delivery are not far removed from those of the original National Development Centre for School Management Training Centre 25 years previously. Despite the differences in scale of provision, there are striking similarities and continuities to "encourage more effective management of the teaching force" (D. E. S. 1987).

The programs are, by and large, developed centrally and delivered regionally, they are focused upon inquiry into practice and they are selectively informed by research—for alongside the programs, the National College has an impressive publications arm. However, tensions among the College, Local Authorities and Universities remain with many still perceiving the College as a juggernaut which delivers uncritically central government policies, serves to add to the diminishing independence of decision-making capacities of head teachers and other leaders.

6.3 In-Service Training of Principals—the Swedish Case

State involvement in the training of school leaders was introduced at the end of the 1960s in Sweden, with the provision of short-term courses in a number of pedagogical and administrative areas. During the first half of the 1970s, as a result of the Commission on the Internal Work of Schools (SIA 1974), the State emphasized the need for a foundational training program for principals. In 1976 the Riksdag enacted legislation introducing a 2-year national training program for all principals in the national school system. The aim was to make principals better equipped to direct and take charge of the development of schools in line with the national goals relating to pedagogical leadership. This is important to remember because that focus is still valid for principal training in Sweden. The training was initially to be run for a 10-year experimental period, with a subsequent review. As a result of the review, the Riksdag decided in 1986 on a broader integrated program of principal training, with the State and municipalities given responsibility for different parts of the training. The intention of the Riksdag was to give principals a thorough understanding of the goals of the school and equip them with leadership skills that would stimulate the development of school activities.

Four steps of training were introduced:

- *A recruitment training program* for persons who wanted to become principals. Training would provide a broad view of different school leadership functions, but retain a focus on the national goals for education. The Riksdag's intention in introducing this program also had three other elements: (1) more women as school leaders; (2) more recruitment from other municipalities; and, (3) more people with other educational backgrounds to become principals.
- *An introduction training program* to help new principals during their first years in office. The main focus was on practical and administrative tasks, but also that the principal should be introduced to pedagogical leadership.
- *A National Head teachers training program* to be followed by all principals after about 2 years in office. This program lasts 2 years and comprises around 30 seminar days. The purpose of the training is to deepen the principals' knowledge and increase their understanding of the national school system, the national goals for the school and the role of the school in society and the local community.
- *A continuation school leader program*—university courses for school leaders.

The two first programs were to be run by the municipalities. There is considerable variation between municipalities when it comes to how well the different school boards worked with these two types of programs. The third program—the national head teacher training program—has functioned very well. The reason for this is that the State, through the National Agency for Education, organized the head teachers training and provided the resources needed to run the program. The fourth type of program, academic courses, has been offered at different universities. Unfortunately, university courses have not been able to attract large number of principals for continued school leader education.

The State wanted school leaders who took greater responsibility and were more competent in leading the development of the pedagogical activities in their school. Many initiatives have been taken by the State since then to bring about this change. The most concrete example is the National Training Programme for Head-Teachers that has been running now for more than 35 years. Changing the role of the principal has not been an easy task. One important reason for this is the fact that the tradition of the autonomous teacher is very strong in Sweden. The process of acceptance of a new role for school leaders has been very slow. The highly centralized school system and the tradition of the autonomous teacher have made it very difficult for parents and other stakeholders to influence the processes of the local school.

6.3.1 The National Head-Teacher Training Programme in Sweden

In Sweden, a National Head-Teacher Training Programme was organized in order to ensure that school leaders have the competence to lead the development of education activities and to ensure that the rights of pupils and parents are respected. This requires, from the State's point of view, a national training program for principals.

According to the National Agency for Education, the training must be based on a holistic view of the school in which the organization of the program, its relationship with the local community, and knowledge of school conditions together constitute important elements. The training should emphasize a capacity for reflection, for critically processing information and solving problems. Important starting points for the development of competence are the principal's own experiences with various types of work in the school. Ideas, concepts and theoretical models from relevant areas of research and development provide increasing knowledge and understanding of both one's own experience as well as others activities in the school. The training is based on a view of leadership that promotes a working climate inspired by openness, reflection and learning.

The purpose of this training is to deepen the knowledge and increase the principals' understanding of the national school system, the national goals of the school and the role of the school in the society and the local community. The training allows principals to deepen their knowledge of the role of leadership in a school

system managed by objectives and results, as well as to develop their ability to plan, implement, evaluate and develop school activities. The training also aims at developing the capacity of head teachers to analyse and draw conclusions from the outcome of such activities and be able to communicate their views. Principals shall also develop their ability to co-operate both inside and outside the school, in addition to representing the school in the community.

The program's training goals are grouped into four areas: (1) national and local school goals; (2) school management and organization; (3) development of educational activities—pedagogical leadership; and (4) follow-up and evaluation (Skolverket 1993). Attention is paid in all four areas to the principal's responsibility for respecting the rights of pupils and parents, as well as satisfying the needs of pupils requiring special support. The reason the State has kept control over the program is that it is a good way to improve the principal's competence in relation to the national goals and structures of the national school system.

The State offers the National Head-Teachers Training Programme to all school boards in Sweden. The municipalities decide if they will send any principals to the program. Tuition is funded by the State, while the municipalities and other employers bear the costs of travel and subsistence allowances, stand-in teachers and reading material. The National Agency for Education defines the goals of the head teacher training and distributes the state funding allocated for this purpose. The courses are carried out at six different universities. The Agency is also responsible for the follow-up and evaluation of the training on a regular basis. This program has been running with only minor modifications for 25 years.

During the early days of this millennium the program was reviewed and a revised program started in 2002. In the revised National Head-Teachers Training Programme, the vision was to create a democratic, learning and communicative school-leader (Skolverket 2002). Democratic means that the leader him/herself is leading the school in accordance with the National curriculum and the democratic ideas expressed in those documents. The democratic reflective school leader understands that it is not sufficient that education imparts knowledge of fundamental democratic values. Education must also be carried out using democratic working methods and preparing pupils for active participation in civic life. By participating in planning and evaluation of their daily education, and exercising choices over courses, subjects, themes and activities, pupils will develop their ability to exercise influence and take responsibility. The school-leader also understands that school democracy is for all who work in the school and this knowledge governs his/her actions. The leader must be a learning leader and understand that all leadership is about constant learning and that this is especially the case for school leaders. To be able to lead such a group, the leader him/herself must be a learner, particularly in relation to the goals of the curriculum. If a school leader is to live up to the demands of the national curriculum, s/he must understand that governing power is not just power over money, buildings and personnel; it is authority based on discursive power. If s/he is to live up to the very high demands of leading a democratic environment in a school, one in which everyone feels that they are seen and appreciated for who they are, a school leader must be the change s/he wants to see.

A school leader who is both democratic and reflective in these matters must be a learner, i.e. a person who creates and merges school cultures and school structures by re-thinking and leading through the power of dialogue and discussion. They are also persons who are aware that the learning process and the control of related emotions and anxiety have an impact on educational leadership. Democratic, reflective school leaders who support and promote interactive professionalism, are essential. Therefore, the main tasks of the democratic, learning and communicative school leaders are:

- Leading the teaching
- Leading the learning of teachers
- Developing language, values and culture
- Leading relations to the outside world
- Reading, thinking, reflecting, learning and acting

A school leader can—and should because of the democratic objectives of the institution—act democratically. S/he can be the one agent responsible for having the struggle made public and visible so that everybody can examine what is going on and can have a say in decisions. Accordingly, the leader should be responsible for creating the agenda for professional dialogue in the school and for the associated democratic educational practices. The democratic reflective school leader's task as a supporter and promoter of interactive professionalism is essential and, therefore, training of communication skills is of great importance in the revised Swedish program.

In 2006 Sweden got a new government, an alliance of conservative political parties, that wanted to change the whole school system back to a more knowledge-centred system. They also made changes in the national training program for principals that started in 2009 at six universities. This program has just started (Skolverket 2009) and the contract between the state and the universities runs for 6 years.

This new national training program aims at providing head teachers, heads of preschools and other school leaders with the knowledge and skill required to be able to manage their responsibilities and achieve the national and local goals that have been established. The new program will be obligatory for newly appointed principals and, for the first time since the start almost 35 years ago, be comprised of three academic courses of 10 credits that will each run an academic year. Admission to the program requires consultation with a head teacher's school board and the board is responsible for offering the participant reasonable time for his/her studies and adequate financial reimbursement for training that involves at least 30 days of lectures and seminars and must be completed within 4 years after the principal's appointment.

Universities responsible for arranging the training originally set the curriculum for the course, but since 2009 they need to follow the goals documented by the National Agency for Education. It is their responsibility to continually follow up and evaluate the training as well as presenting an annual report to the National Agency for Schools. Every participant who has successfully completed the course will receive a certificate recording the length and the content of the course.

The implementation of the program will probably not be exactly the same for the six universities who run the program, contracted by the National Agency for Education. Nevertheless, the key features of the program are (1) legislation on schools and the role of exercising the functions of an authority—which covers legal provisions and ordinances, emphasizing how the school's assignment is formulated in light of national goals; (2) management by goals and objectives—which covers promoting that quality required of schools to achieve national educational goals; and, (3) school leadership—which covers how the work should be managed by the head teacher as well as the principles bringing about development in line with national goals.

These three areas are closely linked to one another and are seen as crucial to the practical implementation of school leadership, therefore head teachers must be able to manage them simultaneously since they form key parts of a complex interacting system.

Learning activities include the interplay between practices, policy, theory and research, in order to create new knowledge at the intersection of these arenas. Practical work will be based on examples from the schools of the participating principals. This case method may also include activities and/or discussion at the school of one of the participants.

Comparative approaches and reading of international literature are built into the pedagogical model of the program. The program's learning philosophy is process learning with fellow participants. All participants are requested to be active learners and, in that role, take part in the group learning processes. Together with the instructor, participants will seek ways to inform their superintendents about their progress in the program.

6.4 Preparing School Leaders Across Three Nations: Observations, Recommendations and Conclusions

6.4.1 Observations

Examining the approaches employed to prepare school leaders in the United States, England and Sweden reveals significant commonalities as well as key differences. Across the three nations, the level of increased interest in improving how school leaders are prepared and the energy (and fiscal resources) committed to making it happen is palpable. There is a clear consensus that school leadership matters, but less so as to what the primary outcome objectives ought to be. In the United States, the goal has been to promote "the success of all students" particularly in terms of improved academic performance. In England there has been an expansion of the mission to raise standards of education for all students beyond the academic domain into children's services as well, while in Sweden the objective is an unwavering commitment to maintaining the democratic underpinnings of the society, both in

word and deed. But since 2009, the school leadership program in Sweden has begun to leave the social focus behind and focus more on how schools can work to raise standards of education for all students.

Viewed broadly we see a continuum of preparatory services across these nations with the focus in the United States continuing primarily on pre-service training, while in England and Sweden, where pre-service formal preparation is a newer phenomena, opportunities now exist for aspiring, emergent leaders all the way to advanced preparation for veteran administrators.

Whether through standards for certification and/or performance or guidelines for pre- and in-service preparation, implicit in the training across all three nations is that principals and head teachers must become more facile, responsive and inclusive when working with and through their teachers, parents and communities if they are to successfully improve the life chances of the children in their charge. In Chap. 3, our analyses of successful principals in the United States, England and Sweden led us to conclude that leading organizational learning and capacity building were fundamental to school improvement initiatives and require "the interplay among personal abilities, interpersonal relationships, and organizational structures" (Mitchell and Sackney 2000, p. 11) that emerge from collaborative self-renewal. Across our diverse study sites, successful principals utilized the core leadership practices of direction setting, developing people and organizational and role redesign to reshape their schools' norms and values to focus on student learning through reflective dialogue, de-privatization of practice and collegial collaboration (Louis and Kruse 1995). To achieve these objectives, school leaders often had to overcome limitations of time and lack of support, particularly in schools facing the challenging conditions created by their community's poverty.

The successful principals we studied were analytical, reflective, intuitive, innovative, creative and flexible. They understood the dynamics of organizational structures and cultures, individual and group discussion and the impact of their thoughts, emotions and behaviours on their abilities to lead organizational learning and capacity building. These observations return us to the fundamental concern of this chapter, i.e. how can we best prepare and hone these necessary skills?

6.4.2 Recommendations

Synthesizing elements of the standards and national objectives presented with key design features of exemplary programs yields several recommendations about preparation for leading organizational learning and capacity building, specifically:

1. The quality of leadership preparation ultimately depends upon the quality of the individuals recruited and selected into such programs, particularly at the pre-service level (Darling-Hammond et al. 2007). This is why candidates interviewed for admission to the LIFTS program are always asked about prior leadership experiences, whether in or outside of schools. An individual who has assumed

an instructional leadership role while on the job or a leadership role in his or her community, church or after-school student activity has a visceral sense of what it takes to diagnosis, guide and energize the efforts of others. Dispositions such as creativity, flexibility, persistence and courage can be improved through training, but if these demonstrable leadership characteristics are used as criteria for program selection we believe the entire preparation process would be enhanced and moved along more quickly.

2. A second recommendation that can be drawn from the Stanford study, design elements of the LIFTS program and the preparatory approaches employed in England and Sweden, is the use of a student-centred curriculum that integrates theory and practice and emphasizes school improvement. These multiple sources suggest the following instructional approaches: problem- and field-based learning, action research, journal writing and portfolios guided and assessed by both university professors and practitioners who are knowledgeable about school administration, followed by well-designed and supervised clinical internships that allow candidates to engage for substantial periods of time in leadership responsibilities under the tutelage of expert veterans. The NPQH program in England has now been personalized so that it is centred on interactive, on-line learning, school placement and coaching support from professional colleagues with regional academic coordination. Placing students at the centre of organizational learning and then addressing the real-world problems that may impede opportunities for improved student and school performance help to set direction, define the foci of capacity building needed to develop people and the organizational obstacles to improvement that are in need of redesigning.
3. Beyond the obvious importance of candidate selection and curricula focus, the third major recommendation we believe is needed to improve preparation for leading organizational learning and capacity is the social and professional support required from pre-service through advanced training. Specifically, we strongly endorse the idea of candidates working within a cohort structure supplemented by formalized mentoring and advisement by expert principals (even for veteran principals).

For 16 years, the major strength of the LIFTS program has been the long-lasting effects of its cohort approach. Rather than making conceptions of collective leadership and team building purely academic conversations based upon reviews of the research literature, LIFTS students are immersed in group facilitation and process activities, such as the development of collective norms and individual statements of educational values, from the very beginning of their preparation. The intention of this approach was to build trust among cohort members so that subsequent group projects model future efforts at organizational learning. In fact, this cohort "effect" has extended beyond the 2 years of preparation and LIFTS alumni talk about the strong bonds that remain among members of a cohort even years after graduation. Although graduates may find themselves leading schools in disparate districts, they often turn to one another first when confronting challenges to improved performance. Graduates within the same district, most notably in the Buffalo Public

Schools, have created on-going reading and social groups to maintain the strong bonds developed during preparation, even across different cohort groups.

A careful read of the ISLLC and New York Standards in the United States, the NPQH in England and the National Head-Teacher Training Program in Sweden suggests that the positive professional and social support the cohort structure has bestowed on LIFTS graduates would well serve aspiring, novice and experienced school leaders as they prepare to lead organizational learning and capacity building.

6.4.3 Conclusions

The purpose of this chapter was twofold. We began by arguing that based upon our research presented in Chap. 3 about leading organizational learning and capacity building, high-quality leadership is essential to school success, but that high-quality leaders are perceived to be in relatively short supply. Therefore, our first objective was to examine the current approaches to school leadership preparation in the United States, England and Sweden; considering performance and certification standards in the relatively decentralized context of American educational governance, as well as the more nationalized policies and objectives of England and Sweden. We also described one US program that exhibits many of the key design elements of exemplary preparation as cited by Darling-Hammond et al. (2007). Our second objective was to consider how these various elements of professional training could be employed to better prepare aspiring and current principals to successfully lead organizational learning and capacity building in their schools.

We believe that our three recommendations regarding (1) candidate selection, (2) curricula design and (3) professional and social support, would enhance school leadership preparation and subsequent on-the-job performance. The resulting sense of work-related self-efficacy could go a long way in reducing many of the key disincentives noted earlier, particularly the stress that results from feeling less that competent in the role. If the field of school leadership is to become more attractive to potentially high-quality candidates, they need to be provided a rigorous, well-designed program of preparation that will maximize their potential. Moreover, aspiring school leaders need sufficient support, both professional and personal, from pre-service to advanced preparation that enables them to deal effectively with the challenging working conditions they confront. We believe our recommendations are a start in that direction.

References

Brundrett, M. (2001). The development of school leadership preparation programmes in England and the USA: A comparative analysis. *Educational Management & Administration, 29*(2), 229–245.

Copland, M. (2001). The myth of the superprincipal. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(7), 528–533.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr. M., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs.* Palo Alto: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

D. E. S. (1987). *Circular No. 9/87: Local Education Authority Training Grants Scheme: Financial Year 1988/89.* London. Department of Education and Skills.

Doolittle, V., Jacobson, S., LeTendre, B., & McCarthy, M. (2003). *Tracking leadership preparation to practice and back.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, April, Chicago.

Jacobson, S. (2005). The recruitment and retention of school leaders: Understanding administrator supply and demand. In N. Bascia, A. Cumming, A. Datnow, K. Leithwood, & D. Livingstone (Eds.), *International handbook of educational policy* (pp. 457–470). London: Kluwer.

James, C., & Whiting, D. (1998). Headship? No thanks. *Management in Education, 12*(2), 12–14.

Kimball, K., & Sirotnik, K. (2000). The urban school principalship: Take this job and…! *Education and Urban Society, 32*(4), 535–543.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What do we already know about successful school leadership?* Paper prepared for the AERA Division A Task Force on Developing Research in Educational Leadership.

Louis, K., & Kruse, S. (1995). *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools.* Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

Mitchell, C., & Sackney, L. (2000). *Profound improvement: Building capacity for a learning community.* Downington: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Mulford, B. (2003). *School leaders: Changing roles and impact on teacher and school effectiveness.* Paper commissioned by the Education and Training Policy Division, OECD, for the activity Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers.

NCSL. (2009). www.ncsl.org.uk. Accessed 18 September 2009.

OECD. (2008). *Improving school leadership: Policy and practice.* Paris: OECD

Olson, L. (2000, January 12) Quality Counts Report examines teacher quality. *Education Week.* http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2000/01/12/17qc.h19.html.

Poster, C. (1988). 3/83 And all that. In C. Poster & C. Day (Eds.), *Partnership in education management.* London: Routledge.

SIA. (1974). *Skolans arbetsmiljö. Betänkande. Av utredningen om skolans inre arbete SIA,* SOU 1974:53.

Skolverket. (1993). *Head teachers for Tomorrow.* Stockholm: The Swedish National Agency for Education.

Skolverket. (2002). *School head—Democratic, challenging leader.* Stockholm: The Swedish National Agency for Education.

Skolverket. (2009). *Goals of the National School Leadership Training Programme.* Stockholm: The Swedish National Agency for Education.

Supovitz, J. (2000). Manage less: Lead more. *Principal Leadership, 1*(3), 14–19.

University Council for Educational Administration. (2008). Innovative university programs: Leadership Initiative for Tomorrow's Schools (LIFTS)—University at Buffalo. *UCEA Review, XLIX*(2), 17–19.

Williams, T. (2001). The unseen exodus: Meeting the challenges of replacing Ontario's principals and vice-principals. *O.P.C. Register, 3*(3), 10–14.

Chapter 7
Preparing Instructional Leaders

David Gurr, Lawrie Drysdale, Rose M. Ylimaki and Lejf Moos

7.1 Introduction

The concept of "instructional leadership" has had a long history. Its origins can be can be traced back to the nineteenth century under the inspection systems that existed in North America, England, and Australia. It rose to prominence again in the United States in the 1970s when the instruction dimension of the role of the principal was emphasized. By the 1980s there was considerable focus on researching the instructional leadership role of the principal and Murphy (1990) articulated an enduring definition that included:

(a) Developing mission and goals
(b) Managing the educational production function
(c) Promoting an academic learning climate
(d) Developing a supportive work environment

Research in instructional leadership was often linked to the school effectiveness literature, with, for example, evidence that the extent of instructional leadership is one differentiating aspect between high and low achieving schools (Bamburg and Andrews 1991; Heck et al. 1991). Many (e.g., Murphy and Hallinger 1992) believed that principals needed to be trained in instructional leadership; for example, in one state in the USA, instructional leadership was mandated as the primary function of the principal (Macpherson and Crowson 1994, p. 61). Current conceptions move away from "strong, directive leadership focused on curriculum and instruction from the principal" (Hallinger 2003a, p. 329), to views that are more inclusive of a wider range of leaders in schools (e.g., Dinham 2008; Robinson 2006), and which fit well with the idea of layered leadership discussed in the chapter in this book on organizational learning by Day, Jacobson, and Johannson.

D. Gurr (✉)
University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia
e-mail: dgurr@unimelb.edu.au

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5_7, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

While there is some debate about the size of the effect of instructional leadership on student outcomes (Leithwood et al. 2006; Murphy and Hallinger 1988; Hallinger and Heck 1996), there is consensus that it is important, and that in terms of school factors impacting on student learning, leadership broadly conceived is second only to classroom instruction (Leithwood et al. 2006). In addition, there is considerable agreement that the effect of instructional leadership is indirect (Hallinger and Heck 1996, 1998; Hallinger and Murphy 1987; Hallinger 1989; Leithwood and Jantzi 2000; Mulford et al. 2004). Witziers et al. (2003, p. 401) conducted a meta-analysis that showed the limitations of the direct effect, as "the leader's contribution is mediated by other people, events, and organizational and cultural factors." Mulford and Silins (2003) similarly described a model that indicated that principal transformational leadership, working through teacher and administrative team leadership, and organizational learning, influenced teacher work, and student participation and engagement. As Leithwood and Riehl (2003) argue, educational leadership is mainly indirect because leadership is essentially an influence process where educational leaders are mostly working through or influencing others to accomplish goals:

> …the impact of educational leadership on student achievement is demonstrable. Leadership effects are primarily indirect, and they appear primarily to work through the organizational variable of school mission or goals and through variables related to classroom curriculum and instruction. While quantitative estimates of effects are not always available, leadership variables do seem to explain an important proportion of the school-related variance in student achievement. (Leithwood and Riehl 2003, p. 13)

In a further review Leithwood et al. (2006, p. 5) suggest that while school leaders have some direct effects on staff capacities, the strongest influences were indirect and based on providing supporting conditions that impacted staff motivation, commitments, and beliefs.

While research supports the importance of leadership, and instructional leadership in particular, there are many issues concerned with how to prepare and develop successful school leaders. There is growing interest in conducting research, wrestling with conceptual issues, and generating policy and practice initiatives in terms of leadership preparation and development as evidenced by the 2008 publication of the *International Handbook on the Preparation and Development of School Leaders* (Lumby et al. 2008). Partly this interest is driven by the need in many countries to deal with pragmatic issues associated with potential shortages in principal class applicants (Anderson et al. 2008), but, perhaps more importantly, it is concerned with quality issues associated with promoting school success (Gurr 2009).

From a major review of school leadership development programs across 11 countries, Hallinger (2003b, p. 290) identified seven global issues critical for the preparation of school leaders in the future:

(a) Evolving from passive to active learning
(b) Creating systemic solutions that connect training to practice
(c) Crafting an appropriate role and tools for using performance standards
(d) Creating effective transitions into the leadership role
(e) Evaluating leadership preparation and development

(f) Developing and validating an indigenous knowledge base across cultures
(g) Creating a research and development role for universities

Davis et al. (2005) found that leadership preparation programs in the USA tended to be research-based, had curricular coherence, provided experience in authentic contexts, used cohort groupings and mentors, and enabled collaborative activity between the program and area schools. There were multiple pathways for leadership development described with programs run by universities, districts, third-party providers, and in partnerships between stakeholders. Importantly, they noted that there was a paucity of evidence about the efficacy of the different programs, which their on-going research program has partially addressed (see Darling-Hammond et al. 2007). These issues pose significant challenges for the provision and support of professional learning of prospective and established school leaders. In addition, the conceptual chapters in this book indicate further areas of interest. In their chapter in this book, Johnson, Møller, Pashiardis, Vedøy, and Savvides indicate the need for the development of culturally responsive leadership, whereby school leaders are responsive to the needs of all students in their care. Successful leadership for diversity means that minority groups are acknowledged, their cultures honored, and students from these groups are provided with challenging programs that enhance the likelihood of success (broadly conceived). Day, Jacobson, and Johannson make a powerful case in their chapter for the development of organizational learning through the establishment of professional learning communities. Their chapter goes beyond the simplistic notion of distributed leadership to explore the cultural change necessary in schools organized as professional learning communities. The pivotal role of principals' leadership ambition and leadership density are highlighted through cases from England, the United States of America, and Sweden. Given the extent to which there is support in the literature for instructional leadership contributing to effective schools, it is important to explore the development of instructional leaders, and so in this chapter we revisit our case studies of instructional leaders to identify ideas for the development of instructional leadership.

7.2 Implications for Instructional Leadership Preparation

7.2.1 The Case of Australia

In Australia, a 4-year teaching qualification and registration are the only formal requirements for school leaders. Whilst higher qualifications are not mandatory, possession of such qualifications may lead to promotion to leadership roles (Anderson et al. 2008). For example, an internal evaluation of participants in the first four cohorts of the Master of School Leadership at The University of Melbourne, indicated that of the more than 160 participants, 29–50% had completed a formal degree over the course of the program (Anderson and Gurr 2008). This places Australia at odds with countries such as Denmark, or many of the school districts in the

USA, which have licensure requirements, often satisfied through professional and graduate study programs.

School leadership development in Australia has for too long relied on an apprenticeship model in which aspiring school leaders gain the necessary skill and experience on-the-job as they moved up the ranks to the principal class. The findings of the ISSPP in Australia confirm this, with principals describing pathways that did not include formal requirements to gain knowledge outside of the school experience. However, what is evident with these successful principals is that they were all intellectually restless and actively sought new ideas to supplement their significant on-the-job training. The three Australian principals discussed in our earlier chapter highlight different pathways to becoming successful instructional leaders. The reader will recall that our principals included two primary principals (Jan Shrimpton and John Flemming) and one secondary principal (Vicki Forbes).

The three principals represent very different stories in how they came to be the principals that they are. In this section we want to explore their developmental pathway, highlight similarities and differences, and make suggestions for the development of instructional leadership in others.

7.2.1.1 Jan Shrimpton

Jan's preparation for the principalship was based on her developing a personal leadership style, having a strong motivation to do well, participation in formal and informal professional learning programs, and the development of the ability to establish strong interpersonal relationships. She also built on her experience and developed a strong set of values.

Jan had strong motivation to improve schools and liked a challenge.

> Early in my career I was drawn to the socially and economically poor areas where I thought I could really make a difference.

She succeeded in taking on the toughest of assignments. It was at this stage that she started to develop a personal educational philosophy and a set of values. They were based on her belief in making a difference with students of disadvantage.

> I believe in that every child should have the opportunity to reach his or her potential.

Jan also had a love for learning and participated in as many formal and informal programs as possible. While she was a regional Student Welfare consultant she participated in a 6-week-intensive residential program run by the former Institute of Educational Administration (Victoria). She explained how the program was life changing and gave her the confidence to stretch herself to take on the role of principal.

> I was introduced to leading academics who taught me that I could be a leader. By doing the course and reading I felt that to bring the team together was what leadership was about.

It was at this stage that Jan applied and was appointed as a principal of a small school, which she described as "out of control." Putting together her philosophy, learning, experience and acquired confidence she took on the role believing that if she could bring

the staff together as a team to make a difference. She succeeded in initiating a school merger and creating a "turnaround" by creating a new school identity. Subsequently, she was asked by the Education Department to move to another school in challenging circumstances, South Morang Primary School. Again she was able to create a culture of success by improving student performance; increasing parent, staff, and student opinion; and improving the school's reputation in the community. Throughout her time as principal she continued to engage in professional learning and networking. She based her leadership on team work and strong relations which she had developed through professional leading and experience. Jan retired in 2008 only to be recalled by the Education Department to lead yet another school in difficult circumstances.

7.2.1.2 John Fleming

John has developed as an instructional leader through being an excellent teacher and assistant principal, seeking out ideas that work and which build upon his own teaching practice, engaging external expertise when needed, and encouraging staff to be involved in a focussed, yet collaborative effort to improve the school.

John Fleming attributes much of success to knowing through his own teaching experience of what works in schools and he has this confirmed by the success and reputation of the school.

> I have always been a very determined teacher and from the first year I taught I wanted the best out of the kids. I actively worked and I read a lot of stuff that did not make sense to me. I started to devise my own curriculum that did make sense to me and worked—science and literacy. A lot of what I say is what is based on what I did in my classroom. A lot of what I say about excellence I have seen in my classroom. Therefore I know at the end at grade one all kids could be capable of being independent readers because I have seen it and done it. I also know what grade six is capable of because I have seen it in my classroom. This is why I have such a strong belief in what we need to do because it is what I have seen work and what I have used and the young teachers passionately believe in the direction we are taking.

> I don't need that much encouragement and support because I feel confident in what I am doing. I have had all these things in my mind for ages. It comes from the inner confidence that you know what you are doing is right. I don't have any self-doubts about what we are doing and I don't have any doubt about where we are heading as the best school. The proof is in the pudding. I get a lot of support from the region, John Munro (a Professor from The University of Melbourne), the Regional Director and the School Support Officers. When we won the Herald-Sun Newspaper Teacher of the year award that was outside confirmation, as was the other state and national literacy awards. The fact that the school's reputation is so high around the traps, everybody knows about us and what a good school it is. You get that constant feedback and that so many schools want to tour through here and want to see what we are doing and the fact that they getting a different message about what education is about. This goes against a lot of what the Department states.

John is very confident, with this confidence firmly based on demonstrable success as indicated by these comments from three teachers:

> John had a reputation as an excellent teacher and this helps in his leadership.

> He is critical of himself, he always wants to do better. He gets feedback from the success, when he goes into the classroom and he sees the children's work.

> He knows he is a confident person. He believes in himself. He thinks highly of himself in a realistic way. He knows he is good teacher and that he is a good leader.

John is reflective, always learning and always looking to improve himself, the staff, and the school as this quote from the vice principal indicates:

> …the principal is really reflective and can be over critical of himself on a personal level. I admire his ability to reflect on his actions and his management. He communicates that to me a lot. He is constantly changing the way he does, thinks and sees things—for the better, in conjunction through communication with me, the leadership team, with lots of individual staff and outsiders (other principals). He likes to get feedback and reflect on things he does. There are things he does do differently to other people and ways in which he works that I wouldn't, but he is very respectful of different styles of behaviour and open to others opinions. He has had an amazing influence on me. He has developed his own style over a long period of time and it works for this school.

However, whilst John has not done any formal post-graduate study, he has ensured that his staff and he learn. This occurs in several ways. John ensures that appropriate expert knowledge is brought into the school as needed and that it becomes a whole staff learning:

> I am the curriculum leader, but we develop it as a staff and get in outside support (e.g., Munro). Our curriculum is school based and we do it as a whole school team.

That John is an active learner and one who helps others learn is confirmed by teachers at the school:

> He is the curriculum coordinator of the school—he maintains his interest and knowledge whilst many principals let this go. He doesn't see his job as a lot of principals do—it is not only about running a school, but also the kids and the curriculum. He talks to every teacher every day, he is in classrooms and speaks about curriculum with passion. His knowledge of curriculum and how education works has been a key to teachers taking on-board change.

Staff members are encouraged to attend professional learning, either within the school or outside.

> Staff are dedicated and experienced and have high expectations of students, themselves and their peers. All staff are involved in a professional development program which balances the needs of the individual with those of the school. Each year a Whole School Professional Development Plan is established along with Personal Professional Development Plans. (Department of Education and Training 2003, p. 5)

John is an active participant in internal professional learning, promotes supportive teacher feedback and models to staff appropriate behavior and the importance of learning. Indeed, John is a very hands-on instructional leader overall as the following quotes from a leading teacher and teacher indicate:

> Hands-on with every aspect of the school, his style is to be involved with everything. He goes on all excursions, coaches sports teams, etc—no other principal in the area does this. He is accessible, you can talk to him about anything, disagree with him if need be, he believes that all problems should be addressed. Problems that aren't addressed become a negative energy, and it is not solving the problem He believes that these need to be out in the open, a decision made and then move on. The leadership and the decision making process is clear. Everyone knows that decisions are made on the basis of the best interest for the kids.

> The principal implemented the early years literacy program to such a fantastic degree that the kids have achieved beyond what I thought. He brings in his expectations, talks to the teachers, uses his own experience as a teacher and reinforces that by bringing in outside experts. The principal visits classroom twice each year to make sure we are teaching effectively and gives feedback. He is not a threatening presence and so this process is well regarded; he gives positive feedback. He is very encouraging and makes you strive to do your best.

John seeks out ideas that fit with his educational beliefs and the school vision. This is best explained by John:

> The school is here for the children to learn to their full potential. The curriculum side is very important—teach kids at their level. Social skills are very important for our kids—solving problems by negotiation and not aggression. The ethos of the school is based on two people: Canter's work on assertive discipline is important. In terms of managing the kids the emphasis is on effective relationships with the kids. All teachers have a very good relationship with the kids. The kids know that they are valued and respected. Slavin's work on whole school improvement is also important. The curriculum needs to be structured and explicit. It is clearly mapped out for teachers what is expected in terms of curriculum. Not only what students will learn, but also how they will learn it. Teacher responsibility to the kids is important, as is accountability to the principal—monitoring performance is important for both students and teachers. We are data driven, we benchmark the kids performance, and report regularly.

7.2.1.3 Vicki Forbes

Vicki Forbes has in many ways a more conventional pathway to her style of instructional leadership. During her time as an assistant principal, Vicki completed masters level study in educational leadership (Master of Educational Management at The University of Melbourne). She has always been active in attending conferences and other professional learning opportunities.

Vicki is inquisitive and restless, and she described herself as someone who "liked to be continually learning." A leading teacher confirmed this but also noted Vicki's commitment to the learning of others, promoting a learning community culture:

> Well with Vicki's vision, her focus is on teaching and she is also very heavily focused on teacher's own professional development. I think a lot of people would agree that the vision of a school is on learning both in the classroom and also with teachers continuing to be ongoing learners as well. VF models that herself. As an ongoing learner she frequently talks about books she has read, conferences she has been to and so there is that sort of role modelling going on.

This teacher went on to say:

> Vicki's vision is that of a learning institution, working on the professional learning team model.

The modelling of appropriate behaviors is an important feature of Vicki's leadership and was noted by one of the parents:

> She has won the school over, it has become hers, the students have embraced the notion of community as she sees it. Last year, at the valedictory dinner when they counted the num-

> ber of times she said community it was quite hilarious. But it has been positive how they laughed with her rather than at her, which is really good from the year twelve students. So I think it is quite an achievement.

In our interviews with Vicki she noted several times how she incorporated her latest reading/learning into her leadership practice. For example, the idea of establishing a professional learning community came from reading Peter Senge's work:

> Since first reading his book, The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organisation, in the mid-nineties I have increasingly been drawn to the inspiration of the "learning community" concept. While I believe the school is travelling the right path there is still a significant journey ahead.

As a further example, describing the appointment of a school chaplain, Vicki explained how connection with relevant literature has seeded this idea:

> In terms of leadership, you have to work out what nourishes your soul and make certain that you make space to do that particularly if you don't believe in religion. Reading some of Andrew Fuller's books, he very much talks about the spiritual well-being of young people and it seems to me there is a gap in their health and well-being particularly their well-being as they don't grow up in households that are openly Christian or who practice any form of religion. So I felt that the role that a chaplain fills was very complimentary to the student well-being team and the chaplain just offers a different perspective for many students in terms of the type of role they could fulfil. When I wrote the job description I spoke about spiritual and emotional health and well being and that was part of the selection criteria—having demonstrated experience and skills in that area. It was providing another option for students, a person who is not from a teaching background.

From our earlier chapter, the outstanding feature of Vicki as an instructional leader was her desire to help teachers develop and become active learners who are constantly seeking ways to improve practice:

> My personal vision is that all of the teachers in the school would have the skills and capacity to be excellent class room teachers and therefore create learning experiences for students that would help them to achieve their personal best…(to)…Create a culture where teachers see themselves as professionals who are able to look at evidence and act upon that evidence with respect to what's happening in the classrooms.

Part of this emphasis on staff development is creating a distributed leadership environment:

> One of the priorities is to build the capacity of the staff by putting in place a model for leadership development of staff. We have leadership model developments in place for students, but we certainly need to build the capacity of the leaders in the school to develop the staff that they work with—a distributed leadership model.
>
> People, People, People…where I would like to go now is to really develop the capacity of staff members who are in leadership positions to develop their capacity as leaders and to embed that continuous improvement and continuous reflection into the culture of the school…I think the key is building the capacity of others and building teams. I am very big on developing teams and working with other people. I think you achieve far more as a team is far more powerful than individuals.

Both the development of people, and creating a distributed leadership environment reflect Vicki's unending desire to learn, and to foster this in others. Her pathway to

being a successful instructional leader is characterized by a life-long learning orientation, an emphasis on developing others, and clear evidence of her own development through completion of post-graduate study, wide reading, and participation at conferences and other professional learning opportunities.

7.2.1.4 Summary of Leadership Preparation

In subsequent years to their appointments, the system in which these principals forged their careers has changed. Across Australia, credentialing and mandatory programs for principalship preparation are still not regulated or legislated by governments or educational systems. However, what has changed is a recognition that unless systems prepare and foster a new generation of principals, the education systems will be in crisis (Anderson et al. 2008). The process is no longer ad hoc and dependent on an individual's own ability to carve out their career. Education systems have developed a raft of programs including formal and informal programs, coaching, mentoring, and shadowing programs, regional-based programs, internships, and leave to attend international conferences and programs. Programs are designed to target various groups—emerging leaders, aspiring principals, beginning principals, experienced principals, and leadership teams. There are sponsored formal qualification programs, including master-level programs, for aspiring and current principals. Various teacher and principal associations are also offering programs for their members. Education systems are also developing standards for the principalship and developing leadership institutes.

The state of Victoria, in which these three principals work, has over the last decade developed a comprehensive leadership development program that has been described in an OECD review as "an outstanding example of large-scale reform… at the cutting edge" (Matthews et al. 2008, pp. 204–205). The Victorian Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) has established a leadership framework, *The Developmental Learning Framework for School Leaders*, that is based on five leadership domains; technical leadership, human leadership, educational leadership, cultural leadership, and symbolic leadership. The framework is used for self-assessment, performance and development reviews, principal selection, coaching and mentoring, leadership induction and planning, and designing a range of professional learning programs that target different groups in terms of leadership development. Individual teachers and school leaders can access the iLead, 360-degree web-based survey to receive comprehensive feedback about their leadership linked to the leadership framework. The DEECD has recently developed a leadership institute that is to be fully functional in 2010 (the Bastow Institute of Educational Leadership—www.education.vic.gov.au/proflearning/bastowinstitute), and which will be the vehicle through which a comprehensive set of new leadership programs will be provided.

This climate is very different from the experiences of our successful school leaders. So what does our research show us that is still useful today. Firstly, it shows that no matter what training and support is in place, personal motivation matters. Sec-

ondly, the successful principals in this study had a love for learning and participated in whatever formal or informal programs were available. Thirdly, they had a strong career orientation and they accepted personal responsibility for their development to create their own future. Fourthly, they demonstrated "self-leadership" working from the "inside-out." They developed personally by reflecting on their practice and learning through experience. Fifthly, they established a set of values and principles that guided their actions. Finally, they fully engaged in networks and regional and state committees of various kinds to offer their expertise, and to gain from the experience. Many of these are personal qualities and characteristics, and the question is can these be fostered and enhanced through the new preparation programs being established today?

7.2.2 The Case of the USA

Certification (or licensing) of public school personnel is the purview of each state, and most state education departments use college/university programs as the most common route to educational administration licensure. Educational administration program requirements vary considerably from state to state in terms of length, and exit criteria. Some states require internships; others rely solely on coursework. Some states require exit tests or assessments; most do not. Two states—Michigan and South Dakota—do not require certification of either principals or superintendents. Five additional states—Florida, Hawaii, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Wyoming—as well as the District of Columbia—do not issue certificates to superintendents. In all of these states, the local school districts usually require what other states require in terms of regular certification.

In order to attain an initial School Building Leader (SBL) license in New York, the state in which our US cases are situated, candidates must have at least 3 years of teaching or pupil services experience, complete a SBL program, complete 15 weeks of internship experience, hold a Masters degree, and pass the SBL Assessment. Further, principals must complete 175 hours of professional development within every 5-year period in order to retain certification. While school leadership certificate programs vary across states and university preparation programs, most programs include one course in curriculum and instructional leadership. In the next section, we examine instructional leadership preparation for the principals in each of the three US cases.

7.2.2.1 Mary Romano: Principal of Coleman Elementary

Mary Romano attained her principal certification along with a Masters degree in educational administration. She served as an assistant principal and principal of an urban elementary school prior to assuming her position at Coleman, a first-ring suburban school. After she attained her principal certification, Mary attended many

professional development activities that helped her learn "new strategies and ways to individualize instruction for all learners." Coleman teachers frequently commented on Mary's student-centered philosophy and her ability to foster a positive learning culture among teachers. As one veteran teacher put it,

> When she first started as the principal, Mary had to deal with many teachers who were getting set in their ways. They were good solid teachers, but the demographics of our school were changing rapidly. We needed to adjust to this new group of students and it meant we needed to learn how to differentiate instruction and teach with balanced literacy.

Other teachers also talked about how Mary fostered a student-centered philosophy of instruction at the school. They identified her as a model of instructional leadership but one who led from behind.

> Teacher 1: When Mary started as our principal, she was very skilled in knowing about balanced literacy and differentiated instruction, but she did not shove it down our throats. She has a very collaborative way of leading from behind. She brought us all together and showed us the data that we needed to change to meet the needs of the new students. She asked us how we were going to do that? She empowered teachers to study with her and that's where we came to differentiated instruction and balanced literacy. It's made all the difference in the school.

> Teacher 2: I think Mary's strength is that she has a way of supporting teachers as learners. She has clear, high expectations, but that doesn't mean she's a dictator. She expects us to study and work hard, and she's right there with the information we need to study and go further with our teaching. She boosts us up as we climb.

This teacher went on to say:

> Mary's vision is one of a learning community and that means a learning community for teachers as well as for students. She's really set up a team of learners in the school, and she's the model.

Mary's skills at modelling instructional leadership skills were also noted by teachers' aides. For example, one teacher aide commented:

> This school was always a bit like a family but with all the new students with all of their needs, it was getting to be a challenge. She's embraced all of the children where they are and helped all of the aides be a part of the larger goal of teaching children to their highest potential regardless of their home backgrounds. We were really lucky when she cam and she was so knowledgeable about teaching practices. The school is much better for it.

While Mary attended one class in instructional leadership as part of her certification and masters program, she credited her post-degree training from a professional organization and her own reading with helping her develop her instructional leadership skills. In Mary's words,

> I took a good course in curriculum and instructional leadership that really gave me good skills in supervision, but that really is pretty minimal training. I have to say I really developed my instructional leadership and curriculum development skills after my training by attending professional conferences, keeping up with my reading, and getting ideas from colleagues in the area.

In this comment, Mary Romano clearly noted the importance of an instructional leadership course, and yet she acknowledged how much more she learned from

post-certification training from professional organizations, networks, and her own professional reading habits. Throughout our interviews with Mary, teachers, and staff members, we also heard numerous comments about how she incorporated her knowledge of current research into her practice. For example, Mary read and shared Tomlinson's (2001) book, How to *Differentiate Instruction in Mixed Ability Classrooms* as the foundation for student-centered learning at Coleman. As Mary described,

> When I first read Differentiated Instruction, I was just struck by how applicable the ideas were for our school. I've read it several times since then and shared it with our teachers. I think the ideas of differentiation and student-led instruction have been the foundations for change at the school.

As a further example, Mary described how she became interested in guided reading and balanced literacy when she read Fountes and Pinnell's (2001) book, *Guiding Readers and Writers*. Balanced literacy was another major curriculum initiative at Coleman.

> My personal belief is that literacy instruction needs to be provided in balance for most children. That's common sense, but how do you do that? Fountes and Pinnell's book was very practical but it also gave teachers a good understanding of how to teach reading and writing. Many of our teachers just do not come out of university preparation with that skill now. It's just very complex, particularly if you're dealing with a population of students like ours that do not have sufficient background knowledge for comprehension instruction. This book provides strategies and ways to level books. I got the book for all of the teachers and we read it together in small groups and as a faculty we agreed to level our books. We also sent several teachers to workshops and they came back and turn-keyed what they learned to the faculty as a whole. This again is how we developed capacity for change with balanced literacy and differentiated instruction, using our learning organization as a vehicle for professional learning and capacity building.

At the same time, Mary Romano purposely developed teacher leadership and created a distributed leadership model at Coleman. As she described,

> I believed in balanced literacy for children and I also believe we need balanced leadership in the school. Early on, I made it a point to develop teams for leadership of curriculum. We have grade level teams and committees that have built capacity of distributed teacher leadership in the school.
>
> We have a good system for distributed leadership in the school, but it could always be improved. I think the key is in building a team with the knowledge, skills, and caring about each other to really drive continuous school improvement. If you have teacher leadership, a caring culture, and strong pedagogical knowledge, you can really make a difference for kids.

Many teachers also talked about Mary Romano's way of leading through an ethic of care. She made sure that teachers were able to take care of their families, often covering their classes if they needed to leave early for family reasons.

> Teacher 1: She's really taken care of everyone in the school. Once I had to leave school during the day to pick up my sick child and she covered my classroom. She said, "You need to take care of your family. I'll cover for you." I knew she really cared about me as a person.
>
> Teacher 2: Mary has such a caring personality. She always knows when there is something special (good or bad) happening in my family, and she's right there with a note or a comment.

> Teacher 3: I think she has a way about her that makes you feel comfortable and cared for. I don't mean she's laissez-faire. I know she has high expectations for me and my students, but I also know that she cares how we feel and that we are happy and healthy in the school. It's not just about the numbers on the tests.

Mary's ethic of care for students and teachers combined with strong pedagogical knowledge and capacity-building skills fostered a positive learning culture and student-centered curriculum change at Coleman. Essentially, Mary developed her instructional skills through experience as well as ongoing professional learning.

7.2.2.2 The Principal of Fraser School

The Fraser School principal also developed her instructional leadership knowledge and skills primarily through her experience as a principal of another turn-around school, and professional development in literacy. While she earned a PhD in educational leadership and gained principal certification, the Fraser principal clearly linked her successful instructional leadership practices in her turn-around schools with her experience, work with mentors, and professional development activities that occurred after her university certification courses.

> I have always been very committed to developing my professional skills with courses and conferences and my own study. I think experience is important but it has to be informed by professional study. We know research now that helps us understand how to teach literacy and math and other subjects. We need to know what that is and apply it in our own settings. I believed that as a teacher and I believe it even more as a principal. Some of the research needs to be adapted to meet the background needs of our students…You have to fill in some gaps for students because they sometimes just do not have the prior knowledge to be able to comprehend what they are reading. I have been determined as a teacher to make sure that I help children meet high expectations for learning and I believe that even more as a principal. I have seen children go way beyond what anyone previously expected of them, and I know that if we work hard and we create the right environment, all children really are capable of learning.

The Fraser principal talked at length about the importance of her mentors who provided her with models of administrators with deep understandings of curriculum and effective instruction. As she put it,

> I had a good preparation program. There was a good class in curriculum and instructional leadership where I learned excellent supervision techniques. I have to say I actually learned more about how children learn and how to write curriculum from my mentor where I did my internship and the principal of the school where I was assistant principal. Both of these women had excellent knowledge of curriculum where you actually learn how to develop curriculum that makes sense to teachers and affects learning in the classroom. That's where I got my start with learning how to get high student outcomes, and now I really have learned so much from professional conferences and workshops. I have to keep learning and those are my sources along with the teachers, of course.

In particular, the Fraser principal sought professional development activities that helped her develop a strong understanding of how children acquire literacy and math. In her words,

> I became interested in the Teachers College Literacy Project soon after I became a principal in a school with many children who came to school with few emergent literacy skills. Many

> of them did not have books in the homes, and few children had been read to on a regular basis. The TC project helps teachers understand the writing and writing processes in ways that help them make powerful decisions to help children acquire literacy.
>
> I knew that if Fraser teachers could get a strong philosophical understanding about how children develop as readers and writers, they would feel empowered to help all children learn the reading and writing processes.
>
> We could have bought a packaged program and made sure that all the teachers used it, but that doesn't mean they knew how to help children learn. It doesn't mean that children will learn to love books and writing. The TC Project helped us create a strong literacy environment in the school that provided children with models, good literature, and strategies.

The Fraser principal also has a strong sense of efficacy regarding her abilities as an instructional leader as the following quotes make clear:

> [The principal] came to the school with a strong reputation as an excellent principal so when she said she had a plan and started to set the direction to improve the school, I believed she knew what she was doing and followed her lead.
>
> She works harder than anybody and I know she has higher expectations for herself than anyone. She often goes in classrooms and she reads research and tells what she learned. I think it gives her confidence that she's on the right track for the school. And I really don't want to let Doc down. She gives me good feedback when she comes in the classroom and I just want to develop her sense of confidence and do better because I know she has these high expectations for you.
>
> She has confidence and the teachers and parents know it. One time, she got a call that there was a problem at a local store and she kicked off her high-heeled shoes and just went down there and took care of business just like she does in the school. She knows she can lead and over time, the teachers, parents, and community members know it, too.

The Fraser principal initially took the lead with the implementation of the TC Literacy Project, but she gradually released responsibility to her teachers. Early in her tenure at Fraser, she set up a sophisticated, inter-related set of committees to make school decisions and develop teacher leadership.

> I knew that if the literacy project were to be effective at Fraser, we would have to make it a full school effort. At the beginning, the teachers did not have the background to really make a lot of decisions about how this program would work at our school, but they could look at student writing and running records and talk about particular groups of students. That kind of assessment is part of the TC Program. So I set up a curriculum committee and teachers used that vehicle to make decisions about how to advance children in their literacy development. After a couple years, there were some teachers who had attended courses at TC and they were able to take more of a leadership role. They also needed leadership skills, which I provided to them. Now I have those teachers leading the groups and the literacy curriculum really is teacher-driven.

The following teacher quotes reveal the principal's efforts to build leadership capacity in terms of the literacy program. It is interesting to note that these teachers recognize the importance of the principal's leadership to the school success in student literacy achievement. These teachers recognize the importance of the TC Literacy Project, but that program is secondary to the principal's leadership efforts.

> Teacher 1: [Principal] really turned reading around at Fraser. We had programs from the district but I can't say I knew how to teach reading and writing. After the principal came to

> our school, she took charge and really cleaned up the school and that helped student behavior. At the same time, she got several teachers to investigate the TC Literacy Project. That's where I learned to teach literacy.
>
> Teacher 2: We got the TC Project fairly quickly after [the principal] came to our school, but that would not have happened without Doc. She's the one who knew that's what we needed. She was the instructional leader for the school, and now I think many teachers are instructional leaders with her because they know how to teach and what students need to develop as literate citizens.

The Fraser principal is conscious of her role as the lead learner in her school, always sharing current research with teachers and seeking new ways to improve students' academic performance. Consider, for example, the following quote from her assistant principal:

> …The principal is really knowledgeable about teaching and learning. She didn't just come in with a set of knowledge and impose it, though. She studies the best research along with the teachers. That's how we got the TC Project so firmly in place in our school. She was the learner who knew that is what our children needed and she got the teachers on bored. She always says she's not done learning. So we got the TC Project but now our students need something else so we have to study. I think she's recognized for her hard work and how reflective she is about what she's learned and what she needs to learn to grow as a leader and to grow with the school full of leaders. She's had a tremendous effect on me. I can't say I ever studied research in quite the same way as when I started to study with her. That leadership for learning is a lot of what has made this school successful.

Although many teachers recognized the Fraser principal's intentions to cultivate instructional leadership capacity in the school, they also talked at length about the principal's hands-on approach to classroom instructional improvement. She spends time in the classrooms every day and provides teachers with supportive feedback about their teaching. Like John from the Australian case, the Fraser principal is very much a hands-on instructional leader in the school. The following teacher quotes attest to the principal's supervision skills.

> Teacher 1: You can expect Doc in your classroom every day. Some teachers could not handle the scrutiny and eventually left the school. For me, and I know other teachers agree, Doc's feedback has made my teaching better. She has high expectations and I do not want to disappoint her.
>
> Teacher 2: I thought I was a good teacher before Doc came to the school, but I really did not understand the reading and writing process. The TC Project has been excellent staff development, but it's also taken peer coaching and [the principal's] feedback to really get the best out of everyone. She's really hands-on in the classroom every day. You can expect it. She gives feedback, but if necessary, she'll show you how to teach. Our previous principal could never have done that.
>
> Teacher 3: She has high expectations, and she's really exceeded my expectations as a principal. The kids and teachers know she gives 100% and she's right in the classrooms. She's provided the reinforcement needed to make the school a success.

The Fraser principal looked to the TC Literacy Project to help achieve her vision for the school. She used her experience, professional study, and shared decision-making systems to model and cultivate instructional leadership in the school. At the same time, teachers and parents validated the importance of the Fraser principal's success

in building a positive learning culture, setting high expectations, building instructional leadership capacity, and maintaining an active presence in classrooms. In a recent 5-year retrospective study of Fraser School, the US team (Jacobson, Ylimaki, Johnson, and Giles) found evidence that the TC Literacy Project had developed to a point where the school was designated as a model site. Further, because of the overall success in literacy achievement, the Fraser principal added several advanced placement courses at the junior high level. Fraser students sustained their achievement progress on state tests and many students were accepted at high-achieving secondary schools.

7.2.2.3 The Principal of Hamilton School

The Hamilton principal is an African American female with a masters degree in counseling education and a second masters in educational administration. She has 14 years of experience in education, but just 4 years as a principal, all of them at Hamilton. She is quietly spoken and serious, projecting a manner of the consummate professional to staff, students, and parents. The Assistant Principal is a white female in her early forties, and many teachers described her as an instructional leader due to her previous teaching experience.

In general, these interviewees paint a picture of Hamilton being a school recovering from recent past failures (e.g., placement under registration review by the state). After 4 years of hard work, Hamilton is now perceived as a school on its way back to meeting the needs of its students successfully. As the Assistant Principal told us, "We were at zero. That was the good thing. We only had one way to go, nowhere to go but up."

Fortunately for the Hamilton principal, the assistant principal, who arrived at the school the same year, had a similar educational philosophy. Although the simultaneous arrival of the principal and assistant principal at Hamilton was more a matter of good luck on the part of the district than careful planning, it proved to be the beginning of significant change in the school.

The Hamilton principal and assistant principal team exhibited active, direct instructional leadership in that they personally taught students on a regular basis. As one veteran teacher told us, "They (the principal and assistant principal) came in and made immediate changes in the school. It used to be that kids could just slide by with doing the least. Now, with the new principals, if the kids didn't know their math facts, they brought them into the office and did math facts with them during lunch or after school." Several other teachers and support staff members made similar comments. The following comment from a support staff member was typical of many others when she said, "The administration here is wonderful. They are constantly being seen, they walk the halls, and they take an interest in the children that you don't see in too many schools. They're not just outsiders looking in; they take a very active role." Notice the language of "they" in these comments. Most interviewees referred to the principal in plural, recognizing the power of the compatible leadership team with high expectations that all children and adults will be successful in the school.

A parent likewise identified the importance of a safe environment as key to instructional leadership success when she said, "I honestly used to worry more about my child inside the school than in the neighborhood. You never knew what would happen there during the day, and most of it wasn't about book learning. Now I feel like there's control and order. My child is safe there, and is beginning to learn better."

The principal also knew that, beyond safety and high expectations for improving student learning, she needed to provide other professional supports and resources for the faculty or they would not produce the desired results. The principal and assistant principal recognized the need for more professional development in effective instruction, peer coaching, and common planning time. Unfortunately, they had few resources for professional development workshops and materials.

The Hamilton principal previously worked as a Fraser Academy counselor, during which time she had had an excellent mentor in the principal. She observed firsthand the importance of ongoing professional development with credible instructors who would work in the classrooms as well as provide background knowledge in literacy and math acquisition. As she put it,

> I could have gone out and picked out some canned program and said, "Here, use this." But I knew that wouldn't help in the long run. The teachers needed to know why they were making instructional decisions and why one instructional strategy might work better than another. As I talked with [Fraser principal] and others, I learned about something called Gap Analysis where consultants will teach you how to look at test data and determine achievement gaps. Teachers learn to look at a student who is doing well, what skills they have to do well, and then teach those skills to other students. The other part of the program is that teachers learn about research-based learning strategies that will eliminate some of the gaps in achievement. I got some funding to attend these sessions myself, and then I just went to the district and said I need this to get our school out of trouble. They came back with a tiny bit more money, but still not enough. So I went to [the Fraser principal], and she went in with us to offset some cost for presenters and people to work in classrooms with the teachers.

Many teachers told us that they felt empowered by the principals' encouragement to apply new practices to improve learning in the classrooms. One teacher made this point well when she said, "Teachers feel empowered to try new approaches because the principal loves to see new things in classrooms." She does not punish or threaten them if their plans do not turn out as productively as first hoped. She tries new initiatives herself, especially when it comes to reading. She has placed a lot of emphasis on finding ways to encourage students to read more, both in and out of school with the development of a lending library, and people note that she will carefully research new practices to see if they are best suited for the school and its students. As a result of these trainings, faculty members told us that they now feel better equipped to identify students who are having difficulty with reading and math and, therefore, better prepared to implement different teaching and learning strategies to help them improve their test scores. Increased professional confidence is evident in the following teacher quotes:

> We're becoming successful at teaching to the tests and getting the test grades up. Eighth grade math alone, I think we had three points the year before last, and last year we went up

> to forty-some. So we increased quite a bit. Still below average, but we jumped more than others jumped, so I think we're getting successful in learning how to teach for the test.
>
> I've been in the school a long time, and I'm now for the first time seeing an emphasis on trying new instructional strategies in the classrooms. The principals encourage that. I feel like I can try new techniques but I know there are not repercussions if the new techniques don't work well right away. It's part of our learning process now.

The principal's positive attitude and willingness to take an active instructional role in the hard work to raise student achievement has earned her the respect of those around her. She is known for treating people fairly and rolling up her sleeves, even teaching children herself when the situation calls for it. At one point, in order to raise the Math scores quickly, she and the Assistant Principal taught eighth-grade math themselves. As almost all interviewees recounted the same story of the principal teaching eighth-grade math, the story took on all the characteristics of a mythology or a defining narrative for this "turn-around" school. One teacher's comments were typical of many others when she said, "She's the principal and she actually taught eighth grade herself. She was with those kids in the classroom teaching a lot. I don't think she was a math teacher. I think she just dug in and learned how to do it. The kids are making progress, too. It made a lot of us think, if she can do it, we can, too."

When asked how she learned about instructional leadership, the Hamilton principal praised her certification program (Leadership Initiative for Tomorrow's Schools or LIFTS) and her master's degree program. In her words,

> I did not have classroom teaching experience so curriculum and instruction was a major gap for me going into leadership. I have to say the LIFTS program gave me excellent preparation. We had two courses dealing with curriculum, instructional leadership, and supervision. I probably felt the most prepared for classroom supervision from these courses. They were excellent. I also have to credit my internship experience with the Fraser principal. She's been a tremendous mentor for me. I was there when she started her tenure and saw what she did to turn the school around. Every school is a bit different, of course, but I felt like I had a mental model of how to lead a challenging school from the beginning.

The Hamilton principal had strong preparation in her certification program and internship experience at a Fraser. Although she did not have teaching experience, the Hamilton principal worked collaboratively with her assistant principal in an effective instructional leadership team, and their hard work earned the respect of teachers, staff members, and parents. They even taught an eighth-grade math class when a qualified teacher could not be found.

7.2.2.4 Summary of Leadership Preparation

All three of the US principals earned their school leadership/principal certifications as part of university masters degree programs. They were all frequently described as strong instructional leaders with the knowledge and skills necessary to improve and sustain success in their schools. Further, all of the principals cultivated positive and safe learning environments and actively cultivated instructional leadership capacity

among teachers and staff members. The Fraser and Coleman principals developed very sophisticated systems for teacher leadership and shared decision-making with regards to teaching and learning. In the Hamilton case, the principal planned to enhance her teacher leadership structures in the future. The Hamilton principal and assistant principal enacted an interesting team model of direct instructional leadership, teaching together in an eighth-grade classroom.

Although the principals attended different leadership programs and exhibited slightly different leadership styles, they all took one or two courses in curriculum and instructional supervision. Interestingly, the principals all stated that they learned more about teacher supervision than curriculum theory in these courses. In order to enhance their curriculum development skills, the principals relied on professional workshops, reading, and mentors. And while these workshops and mentors provided these principals with understandings of how to improve teaching practices and student outcomes, curriculum theory received less attention. The Fraser principal cultivated her own knowledge of curriculum theory and, thus, clearly recognized the value of the Teachers College Literacy Project to help teachers gain deeper understandings of the reading and writing processes. In the current political era of high-stakes accountability and curriculum reform efforts at all US government levels, it is essential that leadership preparation programs provide current and aspiring principals with deeper understandings of curriculum theory and the role of politics. It may be helpful for educational administration programs to seek and foster relationships with curriculum studies. By providing educational administration students with deeper backgrounds in curriculum theory and connecting curriculum theory to the ways instructional leadership is thought about, studied, and practiced, we may help curriculum leaders move beyond the accountability discourses that have defined and dominated curriculum decisions in recent years.

7.2.3 The Case of Denmark

7.2.3.1 Educating Danish School Leaders to Meet New Expectations

For approximately 20 years, some of the school duties and responsibilities have been decentralized from the Danish Government to Local Authorities and, in most cases further to schools. Responsibilities mainly include personnel management, financial tasks, and day-to-day management but, to some degree, also educational leadership tasks. However, the government has for the past decade re-centralized some of those responsibilities by prescribing more detailed national standards and developing accountability and evaluation tools like national tests and quality reports. This means that Danish school leaders need to be competent in administrative tasks (budgeting, personnel, maintenance, human resource management, labor negotiations, and team management skills). At the same time, school leaders must be competent in understanding and interpreting the national and local regulations

on schools and education, including the general purposes of schooling (democratic education or Bildung), understanding of curriculum content, learning theories, and teaching methods.

Expectations for Danish school leaders are inspired by globalization and the transnational ways of influencing education through international comparisons (i.e., PISA) and social technologies. The political impact of the PISA comparisons has been huge in Denmark and in Germany, creating an emphasis on basic skills (literacy and numeracy) and on developing proficiencies, that are measurable and very often based on national standards. This means that school leaders must be able to understand and support teaching that facilitates this kind of accountable learning. Further, the Danish ministry now prescribes school evaluation procedures in which school leaders must report progress on legislated goals and standards for schools.

7.2.3.2 Danish School Leader Education

At this point in time, formal leadership education is not a prerequisite for school leaders in Danish schools. Most formal education targets existing leaders, but some of educational programs try to attract aspiring leaders of all kinds. It is worth noticing that more and more formal education programs are delivered to all general public leaders/managers in order to provide the same general leadership in all public institutions. In other words, there are no differences between leading a home for elderly people, a kindergarten, a school, etc. The local Government Training and Development, Denmark (LGTD)—in Danish "Center for Offentlig Kompetenceudvikling" (COK)—is the Danish municipalities' and regions' nationwide organization for training and development. This institution is closely connected to the "National Association of Municipalities" that is the representative of municipal city councils and the association that negotiates wages and work conditions with the teachers' Union.

The basic educational leadership preparation—addressing newly appointed school leaders—consists of four compulsory modules plus one optional module. The compulsory modules are: School leadership, Frames and Conditions, and Management of Change. (These modules could use further elaboration, e.g., what is the difference between school and educational leadership?) The optional modules are named: Personal competences, Budgeting, Managing Quality. In this preparation program, teaching takes place over four periods of 3–5 days and focuses on traditional classroom teaching and individual assignments. Specific leadership diplomas and requirements are described below.

Diploma in Leadership

For a number of years, University Colleges have offered a Diploma in Leadership. The diploma is in public and private leadership, meaning that most of the modules

target middle leaders of public as well as private/production and service companies (modules are similar to those in the next diploma). A few optional modules target school leaders. These courses take approximately 35 teaching days per module over a period of 2 years.

Diploma in Public Leadership

In 2009, the Government established and financed a new Diploma in Public Leadership. This one targets middle leaders in all public institutions. There are six shorter standard modules *(communication, personal leadership, personnel management, development and change, quality and results, organization and management)* and a choice of 17 short modules *(leadership and Human Resources, modernization, project-leadership, competence development, leadership philosophy, finances management, team- and network leadership, quality assurance, communication and organization, coaching, external communication and the press, globalization, sectors, change processes, leading professions, trans-sectorial leadership, and strategic leadership)*. None of these training models are specifically focused on education or on educational leadership. There are approximately 4–5 days of education plus individual work in each module. Small and private companies may offer the modules.

From Teacher to Leader

A number of school districts/municipalities have collaborated with education institutions to plan and deliver a number of educational leadership programs. Teachers participate in one or more modules in order to attain a Leadership Diploma. The education is multi-faceted; teachers participate in approximately 30 lessons throughout the diploma and complete investigations or projects in their own schools. The school leaders of these schools are mentors for the teachers, and thus provide supervision on the basis of their very detailed and concrete knowledge and experiences of their schools. This education combines theoretical insights with practical knowledge in ways that have proven very relevant to learning. This education furthermore facilitates teachers to be more skilled and knowledgeable on school leadership before they take on leadership posts. However, it is worth mentioning that this education is not part of a formal selection procedure; the teachers have not applied for nor been assigned to school leadership posts prior to taking part in the education.

Leadership Teams

Over the past 15–20 years, most Danish schools have reorganized school structures so that teachers work and collaborate in diverse forms of formal and non-formal

teams. Team-organization is developing into a very commonly used form of organizing the work of professionals. Ten years ago, the "school owners" (National Association of Municipalities) and the Teachers Union agreed formally to establish "self-steering teams" in schools (if individual schools chose to do so). Those teams can be given administrative and leadership responsibilities like administration of substitute teachers, special needs education resources, teachers' annual and weekly planning, and teaching materials or resources.

School leaders also form teams around their work. They can be organized differently and comprise the school leader/principal, deputy principal(s) and department leaders/"self-steering team" coordinators. In some schools, we see core leadership teams (principal, deputy, and administrative leader) and bigger leadership teams with department leaders, etc. On the one hand, leadership teams are administrative organizations and, on the other, learning organizations for leaders. Often this is the forum where leaders discuss new initiatives, new directions for the school, or problem solving before ideas, initiatives, or decisions are given to teachers and other staff.

Local Networks

The continuous education of school leaders is generally a local responsibility. The municipalities, who are named the school owners, must establish and finance education and training of leaders. In some cases, they encourage and pay their leaders to take part in one or more modules of a Diploma Programme in Public Leadership at the University Colleges and, in some rare cases, they finance participation in a Masters Programme in Educational Leadership. But in most cases the continuous education is seen as part of the day-to-day practices in the municipalities so they often build on establishing networks.

When producing descriptions and analyses of expectations towards school leadership, we need to bear in mind, that the term, "school leaders," can be an extremely fluid term. We think we talk about the same phenomenon, but most often this is not the case. We cannot talk about a leadership theme, sets of leadership practices and functions, or leadership theory, if we do not encompass the government policies, governance arrangements, organizational structures and cultures, and the educational purposes, which define the context in which school leaders are supposed to lead. In some political/administrative systems, there may be less focus on the core purpose of schools and schooling and more focus on administrative and bureaucratic functions like accountability. In the Danish case it is very difficult to determine what kind of research, experiences gained from practice, and political or administrative thinking and analysis that are the used as the basis for constructing leadership education. It could be argued that the wish to socialize leaders into acting as school leaders in ways compliant with political and governance visions on what schools, education, and leadership should be is more at the forefront than wanting to educate school leaders into becoming good leaders of professional learning organizations, thinking of educational organizations and processes.

7.2.3.3 The Career of a Danish Principal

Tom (not his real name) was trained to be a graphic worker in the 1970s. This was a time and an industry that was very focussed on fighting for worker rights through the trade unions, and promoted workplace solidarity. Despite gaining a middle manager position in a small private company with 8–10 employees, Tom was restless and found himself more and more interested in education and teaching, something which, on reflection he was always interested in. He decided to become a teacher. At teacher's college, Tom assumed leadership roles, and this continued into his first appointment in 1979 as a teacher at a school in a socially democratic governed municipality.

At this school he became a substitute for the shop steward and chair of the teachers committee working hard on the educational development of the school. He took part in school board activities and in the municipal joint teachers committee and was thus entering a traditional career path for Danish school leaders. He took those posts for 7 years. At that stage he felt the need to go on, so when a deputy post was vacant in his municipality Tom thought to himself that he would go for it. He was appointed and after a few months he was appointed temporarily as the acting principal in a "Folkschool" (primary and lower secondary) because the principal had been seconded to do work at the local authority. He had this post for 10 months and then was "pushed back to the deputy post" he said. He did not feel good about that as he lost the overview, planning, and delegation functions that went with the principal role.

Tom acted as a deputy for 6 years, then he applied for and was in 1995 appointed principal at his present school. It is a school of 550 students and 40 teachers plus 20 other staff and is situated in a more conservative and rich suburban municipality. Shortly after taking over the principalship he established an educational development committee in the school to help it develop. This was the reason why Tom cultivated strategic networks with consultants and advisors at several levels in the educational system. When he took up his position he cited the Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard for saying that one might lose one's footing for a short moment, when moving, but if one does not move at all one risks losing it for the rest of one's life. Tom wanted to create a professional community in which teachers collaborated more, work more in teams, engaged in pedagogical and professional dialogue, and developed a clear professional identity. He was a direct and active leader:

> The professional discussions can only take place if you as a leader are alert and if you intervene in teacher's activities, if you indicate a profile at once, if you question things. You must have ideals, you must have things you stand for and teachers must very quickly be able to measure themselves against them. You must definitely not be pompous and you must be informal in dealings with the teachers. You must be careful not to create distance and at the same time create distance. Those are difficult mechanisms.

Whilst he does visit classes he does not do so uninvited as he is careful to maintain trust and to show confidence in the work of teachers. Not all teachers were comfortable with the new directions, and there was a turnover of more than 40% of staff in the first 4 years of Tom's appointment. This created opportunities to employ new staff and to form a more effective teaching staff.

Tom relies very much on his professional experience as a teacher to inform his leadership. Tom has only attended some short leadership courses and among them a municipal course that he considered very good. But he finds that having been a teacher before becoming a leader was good for his leadership career.

> Maybe principals do not have to be educationally educated but it certainly is an advantage because if you placed an accountant in the principal's office the school would collapse or the teachers would take it over.

Tom also attends to his professional networks and looks for inspiration in dialogue with fellow professionals. He looks for inspiration whenever there is an in-service course at the school. Then he is very attentive to what is going on, and this provides good modelling to other teachers of what is important; an important quality noted in the leadership outcome research of Robinson (see Robinson et al. 2008). He also talks to private friends and reads professional journals. But a lot of what he does is self-taught: "You have the feeling that this is right. You can feel in yourself, that this is the right way to proceed. It's about credibility. If you can feel that what you do is credible. Here you don't compromise your values."

7.3 Conclusions

Many of the principals described in this chapter relied heavily on professional experience to inform their work as instructional leaders, even those who had undertaken professional and graduate programs. Given the extensive investment in professional learning programs in all the countries (Anderson et al. 2008; Brundett and Crawford 2008; Clarke 2008; Moller and Schratz 2008; Murphy 2006, 2008; Young et al. 2009), this observation challenges current ideas about the preparation and development of school leaders (Lumby et al. 2008; Young et al. 2009), perhaps suggesting the importance of identifying school leaders early in their careers (Huber and Pashiardis 2008) and providing appropriate experiences beyond internships through mentoring, coaching, and the like (Barnett et al. 2009; Barnett and O'Mahony 2008). The importance of having mentors was evident in the stories of the Hamilton and Fraser principals, and all the principals studied were concerned about promoting leadership development in others, and modelling appropriate behavior.

Whilst experience mattered, it was not the only reason for leadership success. Indeed, the search for experience to help develop as school leaders is perhaps a feature of the people that they are—restless, inquisitive, life-long learners, striving for excellence, having high expectations for themselves and others, and being very people focussed. Most had been highly regarded as teachers. This reads as though trait theories are emerging again, and to some extent this is true, however, we are not suggesting that traits define leadership excellence. Nevertheless, it is always worthwhile reflecting on the personal qualities that successful leaders have, and then at a personal level, to reflect on one's own qualities and the extent to which these may hinder or help the exercise of leadership in schools.

Robinson's (2007) best-evidence synthesis of research that could demonstrate empirically a link between principal leadership and improved student outcomes, found five important dimensions of leadership (ordered from smallest to largest effect size):

- Ensuring an orderly and supportive environment (average effect size = 0.27)
- Strategic resourcing (average effect size = 0.34)
- Establishing goals and expectations (average effect size = 0.35)
- Planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and the curriculum (average effect size = 0.42)
- Promoting and participating in teacher learning and development (average effect size = 0.84)

The first four dimensions support current conceptions of school leadership (e.g., Leithwood et al. 2006), but it is the fifth dimension that is of interest for this chapter. A feature of the work of our principals is that they fostered new curriculum initiatives and were active participants in school-based professional learning. Given the effect size suggested by Robinson's research, this may prove to be an important element in the leadership success of these principals. Further research is needed to explore the operation and importance of this dimension.

The principals met all the formal requirements to be a principal, and the reader will recall that these varied from very prescribed processes (Denmark and parts of the USA) to nothing more than basic teacher qualifications and experience (Australia). In addition, many of our principals supplemented the school-based learning mentioned above, with formal qualifications that were not necessarily a requirement. Again, this most likely reflects the personal qualities mentioned previously.

There were several other features that seem important to their success as leaders. They were active in seeking expert advice and support, and they acknowledged the support and work of others in the school (for example, the close collaboration between principal and assistant principal in the Hamilton and South Morang schools). These principals were able to adapt to changing educational climates, perhaps most evident in Tom's story, but also true of the Australian and American principals. Adapting to and using the educational context is a feature of successful principals that has been noted in other papers from the ISSPP (e.g., Gurr et al. 2005, 2006). The principals seemed to be able to develop clear and important values that were easily communicated to the school community (e.g., John's clearly articulated educational philosophy; the Fraser principal's view of herself as the lead learner in a learning community). They were all concerned with what was happening in classrooms, but they were not necessarily directly interventionist; John Fleming and the Fraser principal were the two exceptions as they typified the 1980s notion of the interventionist instructional leaders described in our earlier chapter. In the current climate of high-stakes accountability in many countries, principals must have the knowledge and skills to function as instructional leaders. Findings from the ISSPP cases in Australia, the US, and Denmark illustrate instructional leadership traits and practices effective across three different national and local contexts. Additional research is needed to test these instructional leadership dimensions in other national contexts, includ-

ing non-Western environments. Understanding instructional leadership in the global context of neoliberalism and high-stakes accountability will support current principals as well as those responsible for training future instructional leaders of all kinds.

References

Anderson, M., & Gurr, D. (2008). *Master of school leadership program evaluation. Internal evaluation for the Graduate School of Education*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne.

Anderson, M., Kleinhenz, E., Mulford, B., & Gurr, D. (2008). Professional learning of school leaders in Australia. In J. Lumby, P. Pashiardis, & G. Crow (Eds.), *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 429–455). London: Taylor & Francis.

Bamburg, J. D., & Andrews, R. L. (1991). School goals, principals and achievement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 2,* 175–191.

Barnett, B. G., & O'Mahony, G. R. (2008). Mentoring and coaching programs for the professional development of school leaders. In J. Lumby, P. Pashiardis, & G. Crow (Eds.), *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 232–262). London: Taylor & Francis.

Barnett, B. G., Copland, M. A., & Shoho, A. R. (2009). The use of internships in preparing school leaders. In M. Young, G. C. Crow, J. Murphy, & R. T. Ogawa (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders* (pp. 372–394). New York: Routledge.

Brundrett, M., & Crawford, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Developing school leaders: An international perspective*. Oxon: Routledge.

Clarke, S. (2008). Only connect: Australia's recent attempts to forge a national agenda for quality school leadership. In M. Brundrett & M. Crawford (Eds.), Developing *school leaders: An international perspective* (pp. 138–154). Oxford: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., & Orr, M. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs*. Stanford: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). School leadership study: Developing successful principals. Stanford: Stanford Leadership Institute.

Department of Education and Training. (2003). *Bellfield primary school, school self-assessment 2000–2002.* Melbourne: Department of Education and Training.

Dinham, S. (2008). *How to get your school moving and improving*. Melbourne: ACER.

Fountes, I., & Pinnell, G. S. (2001). *Guiding readers and writers: Teaching comprehension, genre, and content literacy*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Gurr, D. (2009). Successful school leadership in Australia. In N. Cranston & L. Erlich (Eds.), *Australian educational leadership today: Issues and trends* (pp. 369–394). Brisbane: Australian Academic Press.

Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2005). Successful principal leadership: Australian case studies. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 539–551.

Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2006). Models of successful principal leadership. *School Leadership and Management, 26*(4), 371–395.

Hallinger, P. (1989). *What makes a difference? School context, principal leadership and student achievement*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, San Francisco (April).

Hallinger, P. (2003a). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329–351.

Hallinger, P. (2003b). School leadership preparation and development in global perspective: Future challenges and opportunities. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), *Reshaping the landscape of school leadership development* (pp. 289–300). Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). *The principal's role in school effectiveness: An assessment of methodological progress, 1980–1995*. Paper presented at the AERA, New York (April).

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principals' contribution to school effectiveness: 1980–1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9*(2), 157–191.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1987). Instructional leadership in the school context. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (pp. 179–203). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Heck, R. H., Marcoulides, G. A., & Lang, P. (1991). Principal instructional leadership and school achievement: The application of discriminant techniques. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5,* 115–135.

Huber, S. G., & Pashiardis, P. (2008). The recruitment and selection of school leaders. In J. Lumby, P. Pashiardis, & G. Crow (Eds.), *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 176–202). London: Taylor & Francis.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). Principal and teacher leadership effects: A replication. *School Leadership & Management, 20*(4), 415–434.

Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership.* Nottingham: National College of School Leadership.

Leithwood, K. A., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What do we already know about successful school leadership?* Prepared for the AERA Division A Task Force on Developing Research in Educational Leadership.

Lumby, J., Pashiardis, P., & Crow, G. (Eds.). (2008). *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Macpherson, R. B., & Crowson, R. L. (1994). The principal as mini-superintendent under Chicago school reform. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

Matthews, P., Moorman, H., & Nusche, D. (2008). Building leadership capacity for system improvement in Victoria, Australia. In B. Pont, D. Nusche, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Improving school leadership Vol. 2: Case studies on system leadership* (pp. 179–214). Paris: OECD

Moller, J., & Schratz, M. (2008). Leadership development in Europe. In J. Lumby, P. Pashiardis, & G. Crow (Eds.), *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 341–366). London: Taylor & Francis.

Mulford, B., & Silins, H. (2003). Leadership for organisational learning and improved student outcomes. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(2), 175–195.

Mulford, W., Silins, H., & Leithwood, K. (2004). *Educational leadership for organisational learning and improved student outcomes*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. *Advances in Educational Administration: Changing Perspectives on the School, 1,* 163–200.

Murphy, J. (2006). *Preparing school leaders: Defining a research and action agenda*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Murphy, J. (2008). University-based leader preparation in the US: A brief history and emerging trends. In M. Brundrett & M. Crawford (Eds.), *Developing school leaders: An international perspective* (pp. 138–154). Oxford: Routledge.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1988). Characteristics of instructionally effective school districts. *Journal of Educational Research, 81*(3), 175–181.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1992). The principalship in an era of transformation. *Journal of Educational Administration, 30*(3), 77–88.

Robinson, V. (2006). Putting the education back into educational leadership. *Leading and Managing, 12*(1), 62–75.

Robinson, V. (2007). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Leaders (Monograph, 41).

Robinson, V., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(5), 635–674.

Tomlinson, C. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed ability classrooms*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., & Krüger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(3), 398–425.

Young, M., Crow, G. C., Murphy J., & Ogawa R. T. (Eds.). (2009). *Handbook of research on the education of school leaders*. New York: Routledge.

Chapter 8
Leadership Preparation for Culturally Diverse Schools in Cyprus, Norway, and the United States

Lauri Johnson, Jorunn Møller, Eli Ottesen, Petros Pashiardis, Vassos Savvides and Gunn Vedøy

8.1 Introduction

We live in an era of complexity and constant change. The earth has become a global village with a new international economic order, and it could be argued, a new international "ethical" order in our knowledge society. Rapid technological innovation, mobility, and globalization have resulted in new challenges for school leaders across many countries. This changing social environment has been accompanied by changes in major legislation resulting in new governance structures. More autonomy for administrative agencies and other institutions has been the core of many recent reforms in the public sector, together with an institutional detachment from democratic government and politics. Many governments now realize that managing from a distance has created specific accountability and control issues and have started to focus on improving the governance of these newly autonomous bodies. There has been a move from "Old Public Administration" to "New Public Management" and from government intervention to a regulatory state (Olsen 2008). There are also numerous examples of policy borrowing and copying as a result of site visitations, study tours, electronic networking among national agencies and authorities, and the important role played by transnational policy-making agencies and international assessment systems (e.g., PISA, PIRLS, TIMSS[1]).

In the current era of globalization, school leadership issues are increasingly debated in an international and comparative context, primarily due to research evidence that the principal's role is important for improving students' academic achievement (Marzano et al. 2005). If school leadership is important, then we must also attend to how leaders learn to do their jobs in ways that will contribute to learn-

[1] Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS).

L. Johnson (✉)
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, USA
e-mail: lauri.johnson@bc.edu

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5_8,

ing for *all* [emphasis added] students (Crow et al. 2008). This is particularly critical as globalization also means that schools worldwide are becoming increasingly racially, culturally, ethnically, and linguistically diverse.

Leadership development has begun to evolve as policy makers in mainland Europe, North America, Australia, and Asia have enacted legislation and launched various programs designed to prepare school leaders (Hallinger 2003). In the United States colleges of education have developed preparation programs for school leaders where coursework and internships lead to a certificate or a degree (usually a master's degree). In the United Kingdom, inspection evidence produced by The Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) has guided the government's work in identifying and preparing prospective headteachers, developing experienced ones, and establishing the National College for School Leadership (Southworth 2002), which introduced national qualifications for prospective headteachers (NPQH) as well as serving headteachers (NPQSH) (Weindling and Dimmock 2006; Briggs et al. 2006). In Hong Kong prospective principals must acquire a Certification for Principalship (CFP) in order to meet the requirements for a specific school leadership position while practicing principals are required to undergo a continuous professional development program of about 50 hours per year during a 3-year cycle. In Ontario, Canada prospective school leaders complete the Principal Qualification Program (PQP) offered by ten universities in Ontario (Huber and West 2002). These are but a few examples of the increased international attention on the preparation and development of school principals.

An analysis of existing leadership preparation programs, however, reveals a curriculum that often concentrates on areas such as instructional leadership, financial and human resources management, and the creation of external alliances and partnerships. Although diversity issues might permeate these domains, they are often not adequately addressed or targeted as distinct areas of leadership development. In fact, most preparation programs assume that school leaders work in relatively homogeneous settings and therefore fail to incorporate elements that are likely to support principals in dealing effectively with diversity issues. We believe that leadership preparation programs should take into account both the composition of the student body and the community context so that principals can be prepared with relevant leadership knowledge, skills, and attitudes in order to face the challenges related to an increasingly multicultural school environment worldwide.

In this chapter we discuss how leadership preparation, particularly in terms of cultural diversity, is addressed within the context of three countries—Cyprus, Norway, and the United States (New York State). For each of these contexts we seek to answer the following questions:

- What kind of leadership preparation do principals receive?
- To what extent is the preparation of principals associated with cultural diversity and equity issues?
- Are there any major initiatives to improve leadership programs?
- What suggestions can be made to develop more effective preparation programs for leading culturally diverse schools?

8.2 The Case of Cyprus

Cypriot society and the local educational system were unprepared for the changes that resulted from the first wave of economic and political immigrants to Cyprus who now make up 13.7% of the population. As noted in Chap. 4, educational policy and curriculum in Cyprus is very centralized with the Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC) responsible for new legislation as well as oversight of the education of teachers and principals. While the official policy position of the Ministry has emphasized the positive aspects of multiculturalism and an intercultural approach (Ministry of Education and Culture 2008a, b), the reality is that most of the 455 school principals in Cyprus have had little formal preparation to understand and respond to the needs and perspectives of students from culturally diverse backgrounds and their families. This is particularly true in those schools with a small percentage of ethnic minority students because the policy on intercultural education (see Chap. 4) does not provide for the introduction of special professional development in these settings.

Zembylas and Iasonos (2010) assert that school leaders in Cyprus have a critical role to play in pursuing the values of social justice, inclusion, and equality within their communities. They argue that principals should become multicultural in their perspectives and be capable of leading the transformation of the school's social context. To date, the principal's role in Cyprus has mainly been conceptualized in terms of their influence on the mainstream student population. This restrictive stance has major implications for the preparation and training provided to school leaders. As Brauckmann (2008) has noted, there is a growing concern throughout Europe that the principal's role was designed for the needs of a different time and may not be appropriate to deal with the challenges schools are facing in the twenty-first century. As a result, there is a need to recruit and develop a new generation of school leaders with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions best suited to meet the current and future needs of increasingly multicultural schools.

8.2.1 School Leadership Preparation in Cyprus

At present few potential school leaders in Cyprus receive training that adequately prepares them for leadership responsibilities, despite the fact that research findings emphasize the advantages of preparation before appointment as a school leader (McHugh and McMullan 1995). Those who do receive leadership preparation complete postgraduate courses in educational administration offered by both public and private universities in Cyprus. The majority of school principals in Cyprus, however, have been prepared through an informal apprenticeship model where as teachers they learn from watching their principals and then decide what they will adopt or reject when becoming principals themselves (Thody et al. 2007). There is no formal qualification or certification requirement in order to be appointed to

an administrative position. The underlying assumption is that good teachers can become good principals and therefore do not need leadership preparation prior to their appointment.

Professional development for school leaders in Cyprus takes the form of in-service training through seminars, lectures, and sessions organized by the Ministry of Education. For instance, the Cyprus Pedagogical Institute offers a series of compulsory programs addressing primary school principals as well as principals and deputy principals in general secondary and vocational education schools. No preparation program is provided for deputy principals working in primary education because there are no clear duties and responsibilities for deputy principals at this level of education. Moreover, since there are more primary schools than secondary schools, this would involve budgetary considerations to train deputy principals at the primary level.

In-service programs are offered on an annual basis (once a week for 7 months of the school year) during school hours. The trainers include both academic staff from different universities in Cyprus as well as staff from the Pedagogical Institute and the Ministry of Education and Culture. During this period, school principals are partially released from their duties so that they can better concentrate on their professional development.

In-service programs for school leaders are encompassed under four main themes: (1) Educational Administration; (2) Evaluation; (3) Discipline and Health Education; and (4) General Pedagogy and Emphasized Goals of Education (Ministry of Education and Culture 2008b). The general aims of in-service training are to assist deputy and school principals to:

- become aware of new and recently developed educational topics;
- formulate the skills and attitudes of dynamic school leaders;
- develop leadership and organizational skills;
- enhance the personal and professional development and self-concept of school leaders.

Based on the Cyprus Pedagogical Institute's own evaluations, these short courses and seminars are primarily bureaucratic in nature and inadequate to prepare future school administrators. Research conducted among primary school principals in Cyprus has identified that many of them believe in the trait theory of leadership (Pashiardis 1998; Pashiardis and Orphanou 1999). Moreover, a recent study investigating the views of school principals in Cyprus regarding their professional development revealed that they expressed a "moderate" level of satisfaction regarding their in-service courses and seminars (Michaelidou and Pashiardis 2009), indicating that the present activities do not contribute much to their professional or personal development or respond to their overall needs as school leaders. When questioned about the kind of professional development they would like, they identified school-based seminars, exchanging experience among themselves, short courses, and work with peers. This is in contrast to the mostly centralized and general course-based programs for principals "late" in their careers after their promotion to their admin-

istrative post. These research findings underscore the inadequacy of the present leadership preparation procedures in Cyprus.

8.2.2 Leadership Preparation for Cultural Diversity

Because many groups have either emigrated or come to Cyprus for short-term periods to work during the last decade, student enrollment from diverse cultural, racial, religious, and language backgrounds has increased in the schools. As Lumby and Foskett (2008) point out, "leaders interact with culture at the organizational level both in terms of efforts to include the multiple cultures which may be present and also to sustain, adapt or change the dominant culture" (p. 56). It is the principal's responsibility to provide an educational environment in their school that will be effective for all students, regardless of their background (Prentice 1999). To this effect, preparation and development programs should address the intercultural awareness of school leaders in terms of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Lumby and Foskett 2008).

Within the context of in-service education in Cyprus, diversity issues are included under the topic area entitled "General Pedagogy and Emphasized Goals of Education." A course is offered by the Ministry of Education on the "Management of Diversity and Educational Policy" (Ministry of Education and Culture 2008b) which includes the following main components:

- Clarification of diversity concepts in education: social and individual identity, social discrimination, multiculturalism, and ethnic boundaries
- School programs, hidden curriculum and instruction, management and utilization of diversity
- Development of a diversity culture in the school unit

This in-service course is offered to deputy principals but not included in the professional development program for secondary school principals and only provides a snapshot of the theory and practice related to cultural diversity.

The lack of emphasis on cultural diversity issues in leadership preparation in Cyprus is also reflected in the views of school principals. In a study by Michaelidou and Pashiardis (2009), principals identified educational leadership, the role of information and communication technology (ICT) in education, differentiation in teaching, and student discipline as the primary areas in which professional development was needed. Although these topics could potentially include aspects of multicultural education, these principals appeared to underestimate the need to acquire leadership skills targeted toward the creation of an explicit culture of inclusion.

In a qualitative study conducted with 17 elementary school principals in Cyprus, almost half of the principals (8 out of 17) adopted a conservative approach to multicultural education (Zembylas and Iasonos 2010). They characterized Greek

culture as superior to other cultures and perceived immigrants as exerting a negative influence on the country. Most of the principals who espoused conservative multicultural views also favored a transactional model of leadership. Only two principals adopted a critical approach to diversity while two other principals combined elements of liberal and critical approaches. Principals with a critical view of diversity issues also subscribed to a values-led contingency model and a social justice approach to leadership. This research suggests that many principals in Cyprus are not adequately prepared to engage in critical leadership practices that challenge the status quo.

A case study conducted in a multicultural school in Cyprus (Panayiotopoulos and Nicolaidou 2007) found that 35% of the teachers were ignorant of any support programs for teachers who work with immigrant pupils. Similarly, in an investigation of six secondary schools with high percentages of ethnic minority students, it was found that only two of the schools had principals who supported professional development for teachers on multicultural issues (Pashiardis et al. 2009). On the whole, leadership preparation approaches in Cyprus primarily address the effectiveness and efficiency of schools (Zembylas and Iasonos 2010). The narrow focus of these programs fails to prepare school leaders to acknowledge social injustice and critique existing practices. Current leadership programs need to be revised so that principals' attitudes and practices in relation to cultural diversity are targeted in an effective way.

8.2.3 Major Initiatives Toward the Improvement of Leadership Preparation

Recently, the University of Cyprus and the Open University of Cyprus initiated graduate programs in the area of Educational Administration in addition to the post hoc training programs and short courses for principals offered by the Ministry of Education and Culture. Within the context of these programs it is possible for students to select thematic units which address cultural diversity issues. In addition, the Secondary Education Directorship in the Ministry of Education has begun exploring ways to offer training for principals and deputy principals in the areas of school autonomy and school improvement, planning, participative decision-making, and culture-building at the school level. This may include aspects of multiculturalism in that the values associated with cultural diversity could form major constituents of a school's culture.

The most promising initiative for leadership development has been promulgated by the Ministry of Education and Culture (2008c) through their Strategic Plan for Education that will create an "Academy for Principals" in collaboration with international universities. Theoretical and practical training will be provided to school leaders on an annual basis. During this period principals will be released from their duties at the school level. The Academy for Principals will also be in charge of the ongoing and systematic training of managing staff. According to the Ministry of

Education and Culture (2008c), the education of principals is of primary importance to the organization and operation of schools because principals are thought to act as the "multipliers and the main change agents of the school culture." What remains to be seen is how these policy statements and proposed initiatives translate into practice.

8.2.4 Future Needs in Leadership Preparation

The role of the school in students' lives is expected to be more multifaceted than in the past, and school leaders need to be empowered to act as agents of cultural transformation. Currently, principals are appointed to their new post without ensuring that they hold the necessary competencies and qualifications to successfully enact their duties (Nicolaidou 2008). In response, we propose the establishment of a qualification for those aspiring to a leadership position in Cyprus which would be similar to the National Professional Qualification for Headship in the U.K. but adjusted to the local context. This could be provided by an official body of academics, educational administrators, and others who would set the standards, knowledge, and the skills needed for future educational leaders. Such a qualification would seek to ensure that educational leaders are capable of leading Cypriot schools in an increasingly turbulent environment. Specialized provision should be provided for different leadership appointments, such as those aspiring to the principalship, deputy principalship, department Headship, and the Inspectorate.

The Cypriot educational system has launched new efforts to respond to the presence of economic immigrants in Cyprus over the last 15 years such as the production of textbooks for teaching Greek as a second language but additional efforts are needed. We recommend that the short course on diversity issues currently provided through the Ministry be expanded and enriched to address additional issues of multicultural education such as the European policy on cultural diversity and community involvement in the development of a multicultural curriculum. The creation of a new course that specifically addresses the relationship between leadership practices and multicultural education is also needed. In this way, school leaders would be in a better position to develop practices and behaviors that are explicitly targeted to the establishment of inclusive learning communities.

In-service training programs also need to be restructured in order to account for more experiential forms of learning. Cypriot principals have expressed the need to relate professional development and training to their practical needs at the school level and to avoid strictly "theoretical approaches" (Michaelidou and Pashiardis 2009). According to Chin (2003), "conventional preparation programs are too theory-oriented to reflect reality and provide explicit practical help to people preparing for administrative roles in changing schools" (p. 63). In general, traditional, course-based programs should be complemented by clinical training practices such as problem-based learning, mentoring, coaching, and peer networking. These experiential learning experiences, particularly if situated in culturally diverse envi-

ronments, would provide a more authentic approach to the real-world challenges encountered by school principals.

8.3 The Case of Norway

There are 3,650 principals in Norway, of which 3,200 are in compulsory schools (primary and lower secondary, ages 6–15), and 450 are in upper secondary schools (ages 16–19). As the student population in Norway becomes more multicultural and multilingual, meeting this challenge has become an important task for school leaders. Immigrant students from 208 countries currently constitute 8.3% of the population. An analysis of central Norwegian policy documents (see Chap. 4) demonstrates that the official discourses concerning diversity in Norwegian schools are ambiguous. Broadly speaking, core values expressed in these documents stress equal access to knowledge and education within the schools through the recognition of differences in the school community as well as the development and practice of a democratic spirit. In addition, these policy documents emphasize that schools ought to reflect the students' cultural background. Still, vital choices concerning values and educational practices in a diverse society have to be constructed and carried out at the school level. To meet the expectations of the policy documents, school leaders have to exercise ethical and moral awareness and a critical and democratic approach to education.

8.3.1 School Leadership Preparation in Norway

Until the early 1990s no formal education for school leaders was offered by Norwegian colleges and universities. Since the 1970s, however, national and regional authorities have instigated in-service training for school leaders. From 1980 to 2000 these efforts were guided by broad national in-service programs for school leadership. Simultaneously, the dominant teacher unions strongly contested the need for formal, university-based preparation programs for school leaders arguing that experience as a teacher was sufficient to qualify for a position as a principal. The unions also argued for keeping this option as a career path for teachers (Tjeldvoll et al. 2005; Møller and Schratz 2008).

By 2000 the situation had reversed and now the unions argued for formal education programs in leadership and management. Although several universities and colleges now offer master programs in educational leadership, there is not a strong national strategy for leadership development. A main reason is that the municipalities and county authorities are responsible for ensuring that school leaders have the necessary competencies as well as evaluating, developing, and implementing leadership programs and courses. This political course has resulted in a growing competition between higher education institutions, along with private consultancy

firm companies, which compete in bidding to provide programs for local and regional authorities across the country. In addition, institutions have to overcome the geographical challenges of attracting students from a wider area in order to survive (Tjeldvoll et al. 2005). Accordingly, preparation and development for school leaders in Norway varies across municipalities and counties.

8.3.2 Major Initiatives Toward the Improvement of Leadership Preparation

Although Norway does not currently have a mandatory requirement for leadership preparation, in a recent White Paper entitled *Quality in Schools* (2007/2008) the Norwegian Royal Ministry of Education and Research announced that they would establish an educational program for principals. Their aim was to make the political expectations and demands for school leadership explicit by regulating the contents of the programs. The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training subsequently developed a request for proposals that defined the objectives and priorities for a new leadership preparation program and higher education institutions were invited to submit bids.

In their request for proposals, the Directorate formulated requirements for the proposed programs. Master's level programs were to deal with current challenges, and the target group was to be newly appointed principals. While an institution of higher education must be responsible, programs offered should be a joint venture between at least two institutions, one of which should not to be a teacher education institution. In a supplement to this request the Directorate identified four main areas for principal competencies: (1) The students' learning outcomes and learning environment; (2) governing and administration; (3) cooperation and organizational development and counseling of teachers; and (4) development and change. The proposed programs were expected to address the roles of leaders, enabling the participating principals to develop into democratic, confident, and courageous leaders in their schools. Furthermore, the providers were expected to collaborate closely with local educational authorities in delivering the program.

Four bids for leadership preparation programs were accepted the first year: The University of Bergen (UiB), the University of Oslo (UiO), The Norwegian School of Management (BI), and The Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration (AFF). In the following section we will analyze all four programs with a focus on their perspectives on leadership, their choice of content, and the organization and work methods.

The University of Bergen (UIB). The University of Bergen's (UIB) proposal for educational leadership preparation included six main areas: an introduction and overview, their perspective on school leadership, central subject areas in the program, a description of the academic staff, plans for carrying out the program, and program costs. The proposal is a joint application from five universities and

colleges in the Western region of Norway in addition to PricewaterhouseCoopers. There are different theoretical approaches, ideologies, and value orientations evident throughout the proposal.

The introduction provides an overview of general challenges Norwegian schools are facing, including the use of new assessment measures, developing an inclusive education, improving student learning, and promoting lifelong learning. Student learning is characterized as the core activity of schools and the school as a learning organization is stressed throughout.

Their perspective on school leadership emphasizes the connection between theory and practice and identifies the necessary skills and knowledge as those which will help school leaders realize the mandate and purpose of schooling. In addition, dialogue, cooperation, and the ability to deal with tensions, conflicts, and emotions are identified as areas in which a school leader should develop skills. Values identified in the program are equity, trust, respect, and tolerance in a multicultural school. A focus upon professional judgment and ethics is also deemed important.

The central content areas in the program include the school as a learning organization, accountability, and measurements connected to learning outcomes, and the quality of teaching. The approaches and theories vary according to subject area, but none of them explicitly focus upon social justice, ethics, equity, democracy, or a multicultural society. This raises a major question about the lack of coherence between the espoused perspective on school leadership and the focus of the central subject areas.

The University of Bergen's proposal provides at least two possible interpretations. On the one hand, it can be seen as a proposal that seriously addresses issues connected to cultural diversity, but on the other hand it might be a proposal with very good intentions that will be difficult to carry through in practice because of the discrepancies between the ideologies and the approaches to the central subject areas in the program. There is, however, a strong focus on student learning throughout the proposal.

The University of Oslo. The University of Oslo's (UiO) proposal includes the content of the program, teaching methods, a description of the university and the core academic staff of the program, and evaluations from participants involved in previous educational leadership programs offered by the university. Four main aims for the educational leadership preparation program are highlighted:

- School leaders will acquire insight into the position of education in society, the internal affairs in the school as an organization, and the interplay between stakeholders that participate in the dialogue of governance.
- School leaders will develop skills in the management of structural, informational, human, and economical resources in a responsible manner and according to the purpose of schooling.
- School leaders will develop competencies in planning, organizing, leading, and assessing work aimed toward learning and development.
- School leaders will acquire knowledge, skills, and attitudes that enable them to analyze and assess knowledge about students, school, and society.

In the University of Oslo program, schools are viewed as complex organizations and educational leadership is understood in relation to the purpose of schooling and the societal mandate. Among the important leadership skills identified in the proposal are the ability to analyze, manage, develop, and assess the organization according to the school mandate.

However, this proposal does not explicitly address issues connected to cultural diversity. Implicitly one can find traces of it because the complexity of schooling is stressed and an awareness and understanding of societal change is mentioned several times. Leadership is also seen in relation to students' learning and achievement. Although democratic issues are not mentioned directly, they are a very important part of the National Core Curriculum (NCC) and the Education Act that constitute formal parts of the school mandate and the purpose of schooling. Issues connected to democratic leadership are included in descriptions that stress a concern for the future, leadership as a dialogic exercise, and an understanding of the importance of dealing with conflicts and dilemmas. Values are mentioned as important in this proposal but not described. It appears that the University of Oslo has created a proposal for a leadership preparation program that is general enough to allow them substantial space to maneuver.

The Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration (AFF). The proposal from the Administrative Research Fund (AFF) at the Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration consists of four parts. First is a general description of the two institutions responsible for the proposal. This section discusses the importance of connecting the program to the level of the school owner and a description of the methods and tools for assessment of the participants. Second, the pedagogical platform of the program is described. The importance of the school leaders' experiences is highlighted, along with the relevance of connecting these experiences to theory. This will be done through four reinforcing focus areas: self-knowledge, theories and concepts, practice exercises, and community. A variety of teaching methods are described.

The Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration relate their understanding of educational leadership to the NCC. Four leadership roles are deduced from policy documents: organization and quality control of teaching, change and implementation of the NCC, human resources, and administration. The program aims to address these roles and then give the leaders opportunities to examine their attitudes in relation to the roles.

Next there is a description of the organization and content of the program. This part suggests that work on knowledge, skills, and attitudes are important and will primarily be accomplished through sessions where topics are connected to the school as an organization. The emphasis is on leadership practices, tasks, and roles as described in policy documents and in the NCC. Educational leadership is narrowly defined as tasks and roles within the school and school leaders are described in a subordinate position to governing authorities at the municipal, county, and state level. There are no references to societal issues like increasing ethnic and language diversity, social justice, and citizenship education. The four types of leadership

roles in relation to the NCC frame the understanding of educational leadership. This proposal says nothing about the importance of critically questioning the content and aim of schooling. Another reading could be that the focus upon leaders' personal values and attitudes makes the purpose of schooling an implicit part of the program. A third interpretation might be that The Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration views a critique of the purpose of schooling as irrelevant for an educational leadership preparation program.

The text focuses on generally formulated aims and interpretations connected to the school as an organization. Practices and tasks are not directly connected to student learning as the primary goal of education, and societal and local community issues are not mentioned. As such, this proposal does not explicitly address issues connected to cultural diversity or democratic leadership.

Norwegian School of Management (BI). In the first part of their proposal, the Norwegian School of Management (BI) highlights that their leadership preparation programs are developed and carried out in close cooperation with school owners (i.e., municipalities). They propose four separate courses. The first course, the "Economics of Education, School Effectiveness and Efficiency," deals with the school's mandate as it is expressed through national and local governance. The course raises questions about the relationship between governance and local practice, how to make judgments about the school's effectiveness, whether it promotes equity, and how meaningful it is for the students. A central issue is the transformation of resources into academic results for *all* students.

The second course, "Governance and Change," seeks to contextualize and discuss educational reforms in the light of other reforms in the public sector. This course puts emphasis on local schools as part of a governance system with the responsibility to "deliver" education for all in accordance with national and local political ownership. Thus, a central issue is how to balance effectiveness and efficiency, and under which conditions performance management and management by objectives will yield the desired results.

The third course, "Leadership and Human Resource Management," covers three main themes. First, knowledge about administrative law and labor legislation will help the students to attend to their roles as public authority and as employer. Second, HR as an integrated part of the school's strategy is a central theme. The third theme is leadership, and the aim is that students should develop an extensive knowledge base about leadership in general and about effective leadership in particular.

The fourth course, "Learning and Learning Theories," aims to develop the students' competence to analyze and interpret the school's results in ways that will stimulate reflection and dialogue in the organization. Traditional and new learning theories will be contrasted. The aim is to strengthen the student's ability to make an impact on the development of the school's learning environment and learning and teaching practices. Also, information and communication technology (ICT) as a tool for learning and leadership development is discussed.

In addition to the four thematic courses, this program aims to offer leadership training in the areas of communication and the handling of power and influence.

The Norwegian School of Management's program has a strong focus on the managerial aspects of school leadership and the principal's role as executive of governing policies aimed to strengthen the output. Democracy is framed as loyalty to the governing system and the delegation of power and authority. However, the proposal highlights the need for a critical stance in the development of new leadership roles as a consequence of society's changing expectations. The legal and management aspects of leadership are central, but so is student learning (both input and outcomes) and organizational learning.

Special challenges related to cultural diversity are not mentioned in the program. However, since the proposal advocates extensive cooperation with school owners, one might expect that issues related to diversity will be attended to. Also, the strong focus on the legal premises for schooling could imply that policy issues relating to diversity may emerge as a theme.

8.3.3 Analysis of the Four Proposals for Leadership Preparation

This preliminary analysis shows that all four programs attended to the framework presented and met the Directorate's requirements. Next, all four aimed to make use of the principals' practical experiences (e.g., in coursework and written assignments), and emphasized the importance of facilitating the principals' understanding and development of their roles as leaders. Despite this, the four programs offer distinct responses to the framework. There are differences in their perspectives on leadership and in the way they understand the principal's role, and as a consequence, in the ways in which they frame the content areas. They can be grouped into three approaches in terms of how they respond to diversity issues.

The Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration (AFF)'s proposal focuses mainly upon leaders' personal development and work within the organization. The program addresses the development of leadership roles and actions that serve the school's purpose which is described in very general terms. Building on participants' experiences as the main resource for learning, the intention of the program is to facilitate the principals' development of their roles as educational leaders.

In the Norwegian School of Management (BI)'s proposal leadership practices are connected to tasks and roles within the school and school leaders are seen as subordinate to governing authorities at the municipal, county, and state level. Their proposed program builds on this institution's earlier experiences designing leadership education in cooperation with the municipalities (e.g., Oslo). The proposal is based upon the idea of strong municipal involvement in education, which is not necessarily the case in many Norwegian municipalities. At the same time this proposal addresses aspects of representative democracy, granting legal and legitimate rights to govern in educational matters to the municipalities. Balancing acts between the central national mandate and municipal interests are addressed, as well as students'

learning outcomes and quality of education for all. As such the Norwegian School of Management proposal can be placed within an intermediate position among the applicants.

The values described in the NCC and student learning are at the core of the applications from the University of Oslo and the University of Bergen. These proposals stress the importance of a public space where the ideological governance of education and the societal mandate is addressed and public involvement is encouraged. The University of Bergen's proposal explicitly addresses principals' obligation to develop a learning environment that is inclusive.

Cultural diversity issues are barely mentioned in the four proposals for leadership preparation, but it can be interpreted implicitly in those proposals that weigh the societal mandate heavily, such as the University of Bergen and University of Oslo. Issues concerning democratic leadership and democratic processes are more easily detected, again in the two proposals that address the societal mandate, but also in The Norwegian School of Management's proposal which emphasizes an approach to democracy issues as loyalty to governing authorities, delegation, and distribution of responsibilities and tasks. It is not clear whether this could be interpreted as joint consultation or empowerment in their understanding of democratic practices. The Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration (AFF)'s proposal is linked to the "knowledge promotion" reform and to systemic perspectives on leadership. However, it deals more with the development of the principal as a person than with aspects concerning democratic leadership and democratic processes. Between the four institutions there is great variety in the ways they have designed their proposed leadership programs. They all propose leadership education that has the potential to include issues of diversity, but those issues would be addressed from at least three different perspectives.

In 2010 the Directorate has accepted two more bids for leadership preparation programs: Oslo University College and the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU). All six programs will need to be monitored and studied over the next few years to determine how the enacted leadership preparation programs measure up to the proposed curriculum approaches described here.

8.4 The United States Case (New York State)

According to recent statistics, there are an estimated 118,400 principals in U.S. public schools (National Center for Educational Statistics 2010a). New York State, the site of the ISSPP case studies, includes over 700 school districts and approximately 9,388 principals and assistant principals. To be licensed as a principal in New York State aspiring school leaders must complete a state-approved leadership preparation program and a supervised internship. Since 2009 aspiring school leaders in New York State must also pass lengthy written assessments for school building-level leadership and district-level leadership in order to become certified (New York State Certification Exams 2010).

8.4.1 School Leadership Preparation in the United States

School leadership preparation in the United States has largely been the responsibility of colleges and universities, although this has been changing in recent years as alternative preparation programs have been sponsored by local school districts, some in collaboration with third-party professional development organizations. These alternative routes to principal certification have gained in popularity, particularly in urban districts such as New York City, Chicago, and Boston (Wallace Foundation 2008).

Forty-six states throughout the United States have developed professional standards for principal licensure, many of which are modeled on the ISLLC Standards (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium) developed in 1996 and revised in 2008 by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. These standards characterize the effective principal as an "instructional leader" who is heavily invested in the school's core business of teaching and learning. However, researchers have also criticized the ILLSC standards for their lack of attention to equity and diversity issues (Cambron-McCabe 2009) and the weak empirical base for their development. English (2005), for instance, has characterized them as "ideology posing as a science" (p. 94).

At the state level, in 1998 the Commissioner of Education appointed a Blue Ribbon Panel on School Leadership, which identified the following essential leadership characteristics for New York State principals:

- Leaders know and understand what it means and what it takes to be a leader.
- Leaders have a vision for schools that they constantly share and promote.
- Leaders communicate clearly and effectively.
- Leaders collaborate and cooperate with others.
- Leaders persevere and take the long view.
- Leaders support, develop, and nurture staff.
- Leaders hold themselves and others responsible and accountable.
- Leaders never stop learning and honing their skills.
- Leaders have the courage to take informed risks.

Although state and national education officials in the United States have advocated for the adoption of common standards for school leaders, Murphy and Vriesenga (2006) note that there has been little longitudinal or comprehensive research on the effectiveness of leadership preparation programs. In one of the few recent studies on exemplary principal preparation programs across four U.S. sites (i.e., Connecticut, Mississippi, New York City, and San Diego), researchers from the Stanford Educational Leadership Institute found that common features of effective programs included targeted recruitment and selection of expert teachers with leadership potential; well-designed and supervised internships that allow candidates to engage in leadership responsibilities for substantial periods of time under expert veterans; and cohort groups who study together and become the basis of a peer network that future principals can rely on for social and professional support (Darling-Hammond

et al. 2007). While there has been an increasing concern about establishing national standards and improving the quality of leadership preparation programs (see e.g., Levine 2005), until recently there has been little effort to address social justice and diversity concerns as part of the curriculum of school leadership preparation programs.

8.4.2 Major Initiatives in School Leadership Preparation: Leadership for Social Justice

In the early 1990s Parker and Shapiro (1992) noted the omission of conversations on race and gender in graduate programs of educational administration. By 1999 a growing movement had begun within the scholarly community to incorporate social justice issues in educational leadership circles in the United States (Cambron-McCabe and McCarthy 2005). This was evidenced by the formation of an LSJ (Leadership for Social Justice) special interest group in UCEA (University Council on Educational Administration), and a growing body of literature on the topic presented at conferences and published in special issues of major educational leadership journals such as the *Journal of School Leadership* (Grogan 2002a, b) and *Educational Administration Quarterly* (Marshall 2004). Emergent international perspectives on leadership for social justice (LSJ) have also appeared in *Leadership and Policy in Schools* (Johnson and Ryan 2006) and the *Journal of Educational Administration* (Normore 2007). In general, these inquiries have critically analyzed current schooling practices that marginalize some groups (based on race, ethnicity, culture, gender, sexual orientation, and disability) and advocated for leadership approaches that promote educational equity in schools and communities.

Although there has been a proliferation of theoretical and advocacy literature about leadership for social justice, there have been few research articles that offer explicit guidelines for preparing socially just leaders or study in depth those preparation programs which have reorganized to implement this approach. In a comprehensive review of 72 articles and book chapters on leadership for social justice, Capper et al. (2006) identified only 11 articles that offered explicit suggestions for changes to leadership preparation programs. Capper et al.'s (2006) proposed framework for leadership preparation for social justice incorporates: (1) the development of a *critical consciousness* of power relations and systematic inequalities such as white privilege, heterosexism, poverty, misogyny, and ethnocentrism; (2) *knowledge* of evidence-based practices that can create an equitable school; and (3) specific *skills* that leaders require to enact justice in their schools such as establishing a service delivery team to eliminate pull out programs (p. 213). In their model these three elements intersect with revisions in the curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment in ways that enable future school leaders to become "change agents for difference" (p. 215).

McKenzie et al. (2008) propose a leadership preparation program for social justice which focuses on academic achievement, critical consciousness, and inclusive

practices. Their view of critical consciousness prepares their students to live as critical citizens in society to "ensure that schools are safe places for all children" (p. 122). They also advocate proactive systems of support that enable school leaders to establish a professional development system that maximizes learning for all students.

Some leadership preparation programs in the United States have begun to reorganize their curriculum to focus on social justice concerns. For instance, Temple University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania "seeks to enhance the education of the next generation of principals, superintendents and teachers by focusing more on democracy and ethics in leadership and less on accountability and high stakes testing" (Shapiro and Gross 2008). Principal preparation programs at the University of Texas-San Antonio and Indiana University-Indianapolis work with local districts to address the racial achievement gap and develop school–community partnerships in urban schools (Cambron-McCabe 2009). Hafner (2009) notes that leadership preparation programs that have been redesigned to focus on LSJ generally includes critical reflection, problem-based learning, and the inclusion of leadership literature that emphasizes equity, diversity, and social justice.

Some typical curriculum activities cited in the literature to develop critical consciousness in leadership preparation classes include:

- Films about race to raise awareness (Bruner 2008)
- Engaging school staff in "courageous conversations" to raise their consciousness about racial oppression in their schools (Singleton and Linton 2006)
- Cultural autobiographies and life histories where students research their home culture, their language, their socioeconomic status, their formal and informal education, and their demographic characteristics (i.e., age, gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, class, abilities, etc.) relative to the dominant culture (Brown 2004)
- Readings focused on issues of gender, diversity, leadership, and feminist thought (Young et al. 2006)
- Equity audits of school districts to uncover race and class differences in three areas—teacher quality, educational programs, and student achievement (Skrla et al. 2004)

Several writers have also noted that those school leadership programs that have restructured to place emphasis on social justice issues have often encountered resistance. Changing preexisting assumptions and biases is challenging work, and program instructors have found it is easier to change the consciousness of future school leaders than it is their behavior (Young et al. 2006). Capper and Young (as cited in Young et al., p. 272) note that this resistance often takes the form of students distancing themselves, expressing opposition to the ideas presented, and displaying intense emotions.

Few of these recommendations to reform leadership preparation programs, however, have incorporated a focus on the specific knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to develop culturally competent (Bustamante et al. 2009) or culturally responsive (Johnson 2007) leaders in diverse schools of the twenty-first century. Although cul-

turally relevant or culturally responsive teaching has been theorized and researched in the multicultural teacher education literature for over 15 years (see e.g., Ladson-Billings 1994; Gay 2010; Villegas and Lucas 2002), it has received little attention in educational leadership research. (See Chap. 4 for a more detailed discussion of culturally responsive leadership in light of the ISSPP case studies.)

Castro (2010), in his recent review of the research on preservice teachers' views on diversity, notes that preparing culturally responsive teachers represents perhaps the most daunting task for teacher educators today. Teacher education research which aims to prepare teachers to teach for diversity in P-12 schools has identified several important concepts to be included in a diversity curriculum that might be extrapolated for leadership preparation programs. For instance, Milner (2010) outlines five "conceptual repertoires of diversity" to be explored which include colorblindness, cultural conflict, the myth of meritocracy, deficit conceptions, and expectations. He notes that "student learning opportunities may be hindered when teachers fail to consider their own and their students' racial backgrounds and how race can affect learning opportunities in the classroom" (p. 121). Teachers (and school leaders we might add) who adopt a colorblind approach (i.e., "I don't see color—I treat all students the same") miss important features of their students and often fail to recognize examples of discriminatory institutional practices toward students of color such as higher suspension rates for African American males. This is particularly true of White teachers, who make up 90% of the teachers in the United States, although students of color (African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native American, and Asian American) now constitute the majority of students in the 20 largest cities in the United States.[2] Sleeter (2008) found that White preservice teachers failed to recognize the pervasiveness of racial inequity, held deficit views and lower expectations for students of color, adopted a colorblind approach to teaching, and lacked a sense of themselves as cultural beings which led to assumptions that their cultural lenses represented the norm for all their students.

8.4.3 Developing Culturally Responsive Preparation Programs

With a well-established system of leadership preparation programs in colleges and universities, and now increasingly in local school districts as well, the United States is in a unique position to redesign the curriculum of those programs to enable future school leaders to "lead for diversity." A review of the literature on "leadership for social justice" as well teacher preparation programs which aim to "teach for diver-

[2] In 2008 students of color made up 45% of the student population in public schools in the United States. This group included 17% African American, 22% Hispanic/Latino, and 7% other or students who identify themselves as Asian, Hawaiian, Alaska Native, Pacific Islander, American Indian, or two or more races. (See *Condition of Education* 2010b, Figure A 4-1.) The percentage of students of color in urban school districts such as New York City, Chicago, or Los Angeles is much higher, 80% or more of the student population in these districts.

sity" suggests how we might restructure leadership preparation programs to make them more culturally responsive to the increasing racial, cultural, and linguistic diversity in suburban as well as urban school districts. Findings from our analysis of the ISSPP case studies in Chap. 4 indicate the need to develop principals' knowledge base of diverse communities as well as a critical consciousness that will enable them to critique and challenge the status quo of unequal practices. Three potential strategies to begin this process in leadership preparation programs are described below.

Rethinking Selection Criteria for Aspiring School Leaders. McKenzie et al. (2008) advocate selecting individuals for leadership preparation programs who "already have a propensity to question the inequities found in schools" (p. 118). In reference to educating teachers for diverse urban schools, Haberman (1993, 1995, 2005) has long argued that university educators have to find ways to focus more on "picking the right people" rather than on "trying to change the wrong ones" through preparation programs. With the increasing racial and cultural diversity of the student population, criteria could also be incorporated in entry interviews that solicit potential candidates' lived experiences in diverse communities and their willingness to rethink their conceptions of race and the learning capacities of diverse learners (Johnson 2002). In addition, McKenzie et al. (2008) suggest more traditional selection criteria, including selecting strong teachers who have a good understanding of teaching and learning and a proven track record as teacher leaders in their schools. The first step in creating leadership preparation programs to support culturally diverse schools may be to select candidates who already lean toward a social justice orientation and have had life experiences in culturally diverse communities. This includes vigorously recruiting and supporting aspiring school leaders of color who bring their own experiences with race and racism into the university classroom. More racially diverse cohorts are important not only for the diversification of the future school leadership force in the United States but also critical to the education of White aspiring principals who benefit from racially diverse standpoints in classroom discussions about race and culture.

Internships in Culturally Diverse Communities. Similar to teacher education practicum experiences that immerse students in diverse settings (e.g., African American urban communities, Native American reservations, or schools serving migrant students), aspiring principals could participate in internships outside their comfort zones where they learn about the perspectives of diverse parents and communities alongside of experienced "community school leaders."[3] These internships might include not only apprenticing with principals who are deeply connected to the local community but other field-based experiences where aspiring school leaders work under the leadership of parents and community leaders in community-based projects (Auerbach 2009). To be most effective, these internships should be coupled

[3] This concept is similar to Murrell's (2001) notion of "community teachers," accomplished urban educators from the local community who share their culturally competent practice with novice teachers through an apprenticeship approach.

with seminars where students can dialogue and critically reflect on how their experiences intersect with issues of race, culture, and power. Real-world internships in diverse settings could help aspiring school leaders develop a knowledge base about the cultural "funds of knowledge" (Moll et al. 1992) and perspectives that diverse families bring to the school.

Developing More Complex Views of Multicultural Education and Diversity. Castro (2010) notes that preservice teachers continue to demonstrate the lack of a complex understanding of multicultural education and the processes of institutionalized racism and oppression. This is true of leadership preparation students as well. Many aspiring school leaders still subscribe to a belief in individualism and meritocracy that success in school depends on one's merit or hard work, or "pulling oneself up by their bootstraps." This approach stems from a lack of awareness about structural and institutional inequities that affect students of color as well as other students who are marginalized in schools. Aspiring school principals need to move beyond a "food and festival approach" to cultural diversity (Banks and Banks 2010) that focuses on sharing cultural contributions to an analysis of the ways that schools may reinforce inequalities and blame students for realities beyond their control (Milner 2010). Projects like equity audits (Skrla et al. 2004) where achievement gaps and differences in teacher quality are compared across local school districts can help uncover how "schools reinforce social inequality while pretending to do the opposite" (MacLeod 1995, p. 11). These audits might also include analyzing the curriculum to investigate whose culture is included (or not) in textbooks, school assemblies, extra-curricular activities, and parent involvement programs. Engaging in exercises which foster a critical consciousness might help aspiring school leaders develop a more complex understanding of multicultural education and the ways that the school curriculum can be transformed to meet the needs of *all* students.

8.5 Conclusion: Learning to Lead for Diversity Across Contexts

Different policy contexts exist across these three countries, and each has pursued a different approach to leadership preparation. In Cyprus teachers are not appointed as principals until the end of their teaching careers as a capstone and leadership preparation has traditionally been limited to a few in-service courses after assuming their administrative position. Most teachers learn how to be principals through an apprenticeship model by watching their school leaders and deciding what they will implement (and reject) once they become principals. However, with a small number of principals and a centralized educational system, changes enacted by the Ministry of Education and Culture regarding leadership preparation for cultural diversity could make an immediate impact across the country.

Norway has also not had a tradition of formal leadership preparation programs, but this will change in the near future as novice principals complete the new lead-

ership programs approved by the Directorate. While there are elements in the proposed programs at the University of Oslo, the University of Bergen, the Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration, and the Norwegian School of Management which could relate to culturally diverse schools, it remains to be seen if they will incorporate a focus on equity and diversity issues in the curriculum.

The United States has a well-established system of leadership preparation programs in colleges and universities (over 500 preparation programs and 60 doctoral programs), but the decentralized policy context has meant that each of the 50 states can develop their own standards for leadership preparation and certification procedures. One approach might be to advocate for national certification standards that emphasize equity and social justice issues as well as the inclusion of diversity-related items on the certification exams, although this could result in a much more centralized system of professional development. An alternative avenue would be to develop model diversity and social justice curriculum and showcase effective programs through national conferences and organizations for leadership preparation such as UCEA (University Council for Educational Administration).

In our analysis of the ISSPP case schools (see Chap. 4) we combined two complementary theoretical lenses for understanding leadership practices in diverse schools in Cyprus, Norway, and USA. These were culturally responsive leadership (Ladson-Billings 1994; Johnson 2007) and leadership for democratic education (i.e., Furman and Starratt 2002; Møller 2002, 2006; Vedøy and Møller 2007). Our analysis illustrated the significant dilemmas educational leaders have to maneuver in-between in order to meet the needs and expectations for schooling in diverse contexts. In the face of different national policy contexts, traditions, and accountability pressures, our case studies demonstrated how leadership practices that contribute to the empowerment of all stakeholders can create tensions for culturally diverse schools between honoring student home cultures and emphasizing student learning.

In our ISSPP case studies, diversity thrived the most in school environments where language and ethnic minority students were described as equals and all teachers were expected to take responsibility for their education, and the whole school was expected to be responsible for the common good and the development of a diverse society. In Norway this was practiced through democratic processes in the formulation of shared educational goals and an explicitly formulated pedagogy accessible to all stakeholders in the school. The key terms for interaction in the two Norwegian case study schools were "respect" and "care." In the USA this was exemplified by high expectations for student achievement and parent involvement in decision-making. In Cyprus this involved principals who provided for the needs of recent immigrant students and reached out to their families, even in the face of opposition and rejection of these students by mainstream Cypriot parents. Our ISSPP case studies exemplify how principals can demonstrate strong advocacy for students, parents, and communities who have been marginalized.

Based on our findings, aspiring principals should be introduced to the concept of "culturally responsive leadership" through programs that emphasize elements such as the critique of social inequities, the incorporation of "cultural funds of knowledge" in the curriculum (Moll et al. 1992), as well as the mobilization of the social capital

of a diverse community. With respect to leadership for democratic education, the curriculum should incorporate components such as distributed leadership, participative decision-making, and the empowerment of ethnic minority students and their families. A collective decision-making style where behavioral rules and disciplinary regulations are agreed on by all constituents and there is constant communication helps to build and foster a community feeling among all stakeholders (Pashiardis et al. 2009).

Suggestions for leadership preparation strategies to help develop these practices that were explored in this chapter include the recruitment of a more diverse pool of leadership candidates who possess a commitment to equity concerns, real-world internships in diverse settings, and the development of a critical consciousness and more complex understandings of diversity issues through activities that analyze power differences and structural inequalities. Because there are different policy conditions and demographic shifts in these three countries, leadership preparation programs must be responsive to local needs and may look somewhat different, but all should be committed to an approach in which school leaders learn to act as "change agents for difference" (Capper et al. 2006, p. 215) who are willing to challenge the status quo if necessary in order to provide academically challenging and culturally responsive education for their students.

Missions and mandates across these three countries posit that education shall promote ethical responsibility in the young for the society and the world in which they live. The ultimate aim of education is to inspire individuals to realize their potential in ways that serve the common good; to nurture humaneness in a society and develop solidarity among groups and across borders, and foster mutual respect and tolerance between groups. Educators in Cyprus, Norway, and the United States involved in the development of leadership preparation must find ways to build upon aspiring principals' experiences to create deeper avenues for critical dialogue and reflection about diversity issues in university classrooms, through internship experiences, and through partnerships with the community which empower culturally diverse parents and families. There is much work to be done to develop preparation programs that help all candidates "lead for diversity" in the twenty-first century.

References

Auerbach, S. (2009). Walking the walk: Portraits in leadership for family engagement in urban schools. *The School Community Journal, 19*(1), 9–31.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2010). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (7th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Brauckmann, S. (2008). *The impact of school leadership on school results: Exploring the foundations of a relationship.* Workshop presented at the European School Heads Association Conference, September 10–13, 2008, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Briggs, A. R. J., Bush, T., & Middlewood, D. (2006). From immersion to establishment: The challenges facing new school heads and the role of "new visions" in resolving them. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 36*(2), 257–276.

Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(1), 79–110.

Bruner, D. (2008). Aspiring and practicing leaders addressing issues of diversity and social justice. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 11*(4), 483–500.

Bustamante, R. M., Nelson, J. A., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2009). Assessing schoolwide cultural competence: Implications for school leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(5), 793–827.

Cambron-McCabe, N. (2009). Preparation and development of school leaders: Implications for social justice policies. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education* (2nd ed., pp. 110–139). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Cambron-McCabe, N., & McCarthy, M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy, 19*(1), 201–222.

Capper, C., Theoharis, G., & Sebastian, J. (2006). Toward a framework for preparing leaders for social justice. *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*(3), 209–224.

Castro, A. (2010). Themes in the research on preservice teachers' views of cultural diversity: Implications for researching millenial preservice teachers. *Educational Researcher, 39*(3), 198–210.

Chin, J. M. (2003). Reconceptualising administrative preparation of principals: Epistemological issues and perspectives. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), *Reshaping the landscape of school leadership development: A global perspective* (pp. 53–67). Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Crow, G., Lumby, J., & Pashiardis, P. (2008). Introduction: Why an international handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders? In J. Lumby, G. Crow, & P. Pashiardis (Eds.), *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 1–17). New York: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., & Orr, M. T. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs.* Stanford: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

English, F. (2005). Educational leadership for sale: Social justice, the ISLLC standards, and the corporate assault on public schools. In T. Creighton, S. Harris, & J. Coleman (Eds.), *Crediting the past, challenging the present, creating the future* (pp. 93–106). Houston: National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Sam Houston State University.

Furman, G., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). Leadership for democratic community in schools. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 105–134). NSSE, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Grogan, M. (Ed.). (2002a). Leadership for social justice. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(2) (Part I, special issue).

Grogan, M. (Ed.). (2002b). Leadership for social justice. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(3), (Part II, special issue).

Haberman, M. (1993). Predicting the success of urban teachers (the Milwaukee trials). *Action in Teacher Education, 15*(3), 1–5.

Haberman, M. (1995). Selecting "star" teachers for children and youth in urban poverty. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(10), 777–781.

Haberman, M. (2005). *Star teachers of children in poverty*. Bloomington: Kappa Delta Pi.

Hafner, M. M. (2009). Teaching strategies for developing leaders for social justice. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education* (2nd ed., pp. 167–193). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hallinger, P. (2003). The emergence of school leadership development in an era of globalization: 1980–2002. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), *Reshaping the landscape of school leadership development: A global perspective* (pp. 3–22). Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Huber, S. G., & West, M. (2002). Developing school leaders: A critical review of current practices, approaches, and issues, and some directions for the future. In K. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Ed.), *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 1071–1102). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Johnson, L. (2002). "My eyes have been opened": White teachers and racial awareness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53,* 149–163.

Johnson, L. (2007). Rethinking successful school leadership in challenging U.S. schools: Culturally responsive practices in school-community relationships. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 49–58.

Johnson, L., & Ryan, J. (Eds.). (2006). International perspectives on leadership for social justice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5*(1) (special issue).

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. New York: The Education Schools Project. www.edschools.org/reports_leaders.htm.

Lumby, J., & Foskett, N. (2008). Leadership and culture. In J. Lumby, G. Crow, & P. Pashiardis (Ed.), *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 43–60). New York: Routledge.

MacLeod, J. (1995). *Ain't no makin it: Aspirations and attainment in a low-income neighborhood*. San Francisco: Westview Press.

McHugh, M., & McMullan, L. (1995). Principal or manager? Implications for training and development. *School Organisation, 15*(1), 23–34.

McKenzie, K. B., Christman, D., Hernandez, F., Fierro, E., Capper, C., Dantley, M., et al. (2008). From the field: A proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(1), 111–138.

Marshall, C. (Ed.). (2004). Social justice challenges to educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(1) (special issue).

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria: ASCD and MCREL.

Michaelidou, A., & Pashiardis, P. (2009). Professional development of school leaders in Cyprus: Is it working? *Professional Development in Education, 35*(3), 399–416.

Milner, H. R. (2010). What does teacher education have to do with teaching? Implications for diversity studies. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1–2), 118–131.

Ministry of Education and Culture. (2008a). *Intercultural pedagogy and education.* [In Greek.] (File Number 7.1.19.1/10).

Ministry of Education and Culture. (2008b). *Training programs for education officials.* [In Greek.] Nicosia: Pedagogical Institute.

Ministry of Education and Culture. (2008c). *Strategic planning for education*. *The comprehensive revision of our educational system.* [In Greek.] http://www.moec.gov.cy/stratigikoi_sxediasmoi/pdf/17_1_2008_stratigikos_shediasmos_anatheorimenos.pdf.

Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132–141.

Møller, J. (2002). Democratic leadership in an age of managerial accountability. *Improving Schools, 5*(2), 11–21.

Møller, J. (2006). Democratic schooling in Norway: Implications for leadership in practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5*(1), 53–69.

Møller, J., & Schratz, M. (2008). Leadership development in Europe. In J. Lumby, G. Crow, & P. Pashiardis (Eds.), *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 341–367). New York: Routledge.

Murphy, J., & Vriesenga, M. (2006). Research on school leadership preparation in the United States: An analysis. *School Leadership and Management, 26*(2), 183–195.

Murrell, P. (2001). *The community teacher: A new framework for effective urban teaching.* New York: Teachers College Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2010a). *The condition of education, 2010: Characteristics of school principals (Table A-29-1).* http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2010028.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2010b). *The condition of education, 2010: Section 1: Participation in education: Racial-ethnic enrollment in public schools (Figure 4-1).* http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2010028.

New York State Certification Examinations. (2010). *School leadership assessments.* http://www.nystce.nesinc.com/.

Nicolaidou, M. (2008). Attempting a Europeanization of educational leadership: Philosophical and ideological dimensions. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 11*(2), 211–223.
Normore, A. H. (Ed.). (2007). Leadership for learning in the context of social justice: An international perspective. *Journal of Educational Administration, 45*(6) (special issue).
Olsen, J. P. (2008). Institutional autonomy and democratic government. ARENA Working Paper No. 20, October. Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo. http://www.arena.uio.no.
Panayiotopoulos, C., & Nicolaidou, M. (2007). At a crossroads of civilizations: Multicultural educational provision in Cyprus through the lens of a case study. *Intercultural Education, 18*(1), 65–79.
Parker, L., & Shapiro, J. (1992). "Where is the discussion of diversity in educational administration programs?" Graduate students' voices addressing an omission in their preparation. *Journal of School Leadership, 2*(1), 7–33.
Pashiardis, P. (1998). Researching the characteristics of effective primary school principals in Cyprus. *Educational Management and Administration, 26*(2), 117–130.
Pashiardis, P., & Orphanou, S. (1999). An insight into elementary principalship in Cyprus, *The International Journal of Educational Management, 13*(5), 241–251.
Pashiardis, P., Georgiou, M., & Georghiou, M. (2009). Cyprus. In J. Scheerens (Ed.), *Informal learning of active citizenship at school: An international comparative study in seven European countries* (pp. 51–74). Dordrecht: Springer.
Prentice, H. (1999). The multicultural environment of schools: Implications for leaders. In L. W. Hughes (Ed.), *The principal as leader* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River: Merrill.
Shapiro, J., & Gross, S. (2008). *Ethical educational leadership in turbulent times: (Re)solving moral dilemmas*. New York: Erlbaum.
Singleton, G., & Linton, C. (2006). *Courageous conversations about race.* Thousand Oaks: Corwin.
Skrla, L., Scheurich, J. J., Garcia, J., & Nolly, G. (2004). Equity audits: A leadership tool for developing equitable and excellent schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(1), 135–163.
Sleeter, C. (2008). Preparing White teachers for diverse students. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 559–582). New York: Routledge and Association of Teacher Educators.
Southworth, G. (2002). Lessons from successful leadership in small schools. In K. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Ed.), *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 451–484). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Thody, A., Papanaoum, Z., Johansson, O., & Pashiardis, P. (2007). School principal preparation in Europe. *International Journal of Educational Management, 21*(1), 37–53.
Tjeldvoll, A., Wales, C., & Welle-Strand, A. (2005). School leadership training under globalisation: Comparisons of the UK, the US, and Norway. *Managing Global Transitions: International Research Journal, 3*(1), 23–49. http://www.mgt.fm-kp.si/.
Vedøy, G., & Møller, J. (2007). Successful school leadership for diversity? Examining two contrasting examples of working for democracy in Norway. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(3), 58–67.
Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 20–32.
Wallace Foundation. (2008). *Becoming a leader: Preparing school principals for today's schools*. New York: Wallace Foundation.
Weindling, D., & Dimmock, C. (2006). Sitting in the "hot seat": New headteachers in the UK. *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*(4), 326–340.
White Paper no. 31. (2007–2008). *Quality in Schools.* Oslo: The Department of Education and Research.
Young, M., Mountford, M., & Skrla, L. (2006). Infusing gender and diversity issues into educational leadership programs. *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*(3), 264–277.
Zembylas, M., & Iasonos, S. (2010). Leadership styles and multicultural education approaches: An exploration of their relationship. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 13*(2), 163–183.

Chapter 9
Comparative Perspectives on Organizational Learning, Instructional Leadership, and Culturally Responsive Practices: Conclusions and Future Directions

Rose M. Ylimaki and Stephen L. Jacobson

In this volume, we examined leadership in successful schools across seven different countries, focusing particularly on organizational learning, instructional leadership, and culturally responsive practices. As noted in Chap. 1, there are numerous differences in the national and local contexts of these cases, while Chap. 2 reports converging educational policy influences worldwide that are serving to drive and shape the successful practices discussed in subsequent chapters. Together, the first two chapters consider in detail the policy and contextual conditions that interact and affect school leadership across all seven countries. In the following set of three foundational chapters (Chaps. 3–5) our contributors compared and contrasted the organizational learning, instructional leadership, and culturally responsive practices that successful principals use in each of three countries: the United States, England, and Sweden for leading organizational learning and capacity building; the United States, Australia, and Denmark for instructional leadership; and the United States, Norway, and Cyprus for culturally responsive leadership. The next set of three chapters (Chaps. 6–8) considered, in turn, the implications for leadership preparation of the research findings from each of the preceding cross-national foundational chapters.

Regardless of national context, the same overarching question was asked in every case study from the International Successful School Principal Project (ISSPP), "What are the characteristics and practices of a principal or head teacher in a successful school?" Then, looking across the three national contexts for each of the three key issues, we asked, "Which principal characteristics and practices appear to be similar, which are different, and, what might be the reasons for these similarities and differences?"

For each of the three foundational chapters, the respective authors also conducted a secondary analysis of the data they collected from the ISSPP and coupled it with substantial reviews of relevant literature related to organizational learning, instructional leadership, and culturally responsive practices, respectively. Although

R. M. Ylimaki (✉)
University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA
e-mail: rylimaki@email.arizona.edu

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5_9,

each chapter can stand on its own findings and conclusions, when looking across all of the chapters, four major crosscutting themes emerge:

- Understanding the global, national, and local contextual conditions under which schools operate is essential to understanding successful school leadership.
- Leadership practices in successful schools are layered, multi-dimensional, and socially constructed.
- Leaders' values and emotional qualities, along with their intellectual qualities and influence skills, appear to be powerful forces that enable school success over time.
- Successful leadership qualities and practices from the ISSPP cases have clear implications for the pre- and ongoing in-service preparation of aspiring and current school leaders.

Next, in this chapter, we explore each of these four major themes in turn and then conclude the volume by offering suggestions for future comparative research on school leadership practice and preparation.

9.1 Unpacking the Four Major Themes

9.1.1 Successful School Leadership and the Role of Context

The critical role of context emerged as a significant issue in each of the foundational and leadership preparation chapters. In the second chapter Leithwood, Jacobson, and Ylimaki suggest a convergence of policy initiatives across nations with regard to accountability, local control, democratic education, and leadership preparation. Yet subsequent chapters reveal that in terms of the underlying assumptions about what successful school leadership really means vary from nation to nation. As viewed through policy statements, legislated actions, and sometimes litigation in each of the seven nations examined, we find an array of notions about leadership and educational goals for decentralization, curriculum, instruction, and diversity. For example, in terms of organizational learning and capacity building, some countries (e.g., England, the United States, and Australia) have national, state, and/or local policies aimed at school restructuring intended to promote collaborative professional learning. Yet in Chap. 3, Day, Jacobson, and Johansson suggest that this may be more a convergence of practice than explicit policies that promote the development of professional learning communities in schools in England, the United States, and Sweden.

When it comes to curriculum and instruction, schools in every country studied are now operating under accountability regimes that are more stringent than at any other time in the recent past, with performance requirements often determined by standardized testing policies (such as in the United States, England, and Denmark). But while this generalized convergence in educational policy is echoed in a convergence in instructional leadership practices worldwide, these practices are tempered

by a school's specific context as described by Ylimaki, Gurr, Moos, Kofod, and Drysdale in Chap. 4. For example, in the Danish cases, the principals and teachers studied anchored curriculum reform decisions in their democratic ideals and values. Likewise, in the exemplar US case, Fraser, the principal and teachers used their commitments to balanced literacy and authentic curriculum practices to guide their decisions about accountability policies. In so doing, the Fraser Academy staff resisted broader US educational trends toward narrow, standardized curricula strictly aligned with tests.

Finally, increasing student diversity is a phenomenon common to the countries we studied. In all seven of these developed nations, educators are dealing with an influx of immigration that is often fuelled by wars and other social and natural upheavals occurring in less developed nations. In response to these pressures, the educational policy frameworks that have been implemented have tended to be context specific, with some nations focusing primarily on issues related to culture and language, such as in Norway and Cyprus, while others are far more concerned with racial matters, such as in the United States. Not only that, but as Johnson, Moller, Pashiardis, Vedoy, and Savvides point out in Chap. 5, litigation often times has had more to do with how national and state policies have been shaped than legislation. This is particularly the case in the United States.

It is difficult to identify a clear convergence of educational policy around leadership for cultural sensitivity and, as a consequence, it is difficult to reach a consensual agreement about how successful leadership for diversity might be defined. In fact, the pressure to integrate an increasingly diverse student population into their schools may be perceived by school leaders as coming at the expense of their ability to improve student achievement. In other words, successful leadership may be viewed by some as a zero-sum game, wherein gains in one area, such as leadership for cultural sensitivity, slows success in another, such as instructional leadership, and vice-versa.

Collectively, findings from the cases reported suggest that the culture of a particular school may have a more pronounced effect on a school leader's actions than whatever convergence of policy mandates discussed in Chap. 2 might otherwise indicate. This is primarily the case in the approaches taken by district or local education authorities when responding to national or state mandates and their potential sanctions. So, for example, some school leaders (principals and/or head teachers) used decentralization and accountability mandates to help leverage and create an organizational learning culture in which teachers perceived a greater distribution of leadership and subsequently experienced an increased commitment to school directions. Whereas in schools with more fully developed professional learning communities teachers already saw themselves as leaders with the agency and collective efficacy to improve both their schools and even their surrounding communities. In other words, the existing school culture tempered the practices of successful school leaders as they responded to similar policy initiatives.

Successful principals and their teachers also used policy mandates to leverage desired pedagogical initiatives and implement those changes they believed necessary to improve the academic performance capabilities of their students. In the

United States and England, principals, head teachers, and other school members acknowledged the accountability pressures to improve student outcomes, but they also felt empowered and supported in their leadership roles. In one US case site, teacher leadership became institutionalized over a 5-year period through the use of a sophisticated and interrelated set of grade level and school-wide leadership teams that meet on a regular basis. Although accountability pressures were not as intense in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark at the time of our data collection, the principals and head teachers studied all talked at length about how they used national policy mandates for improved pedagogical practices to distribute leadership and improve classroom pedagogical practices. These findings support Leithwood and Mascall's (2008) observation that collective efficacy in the form of distributed leadership influences teacher motivation and commitment to the school vision and goals and ultimately organizational learning.

Even more to the point, with regard to local context, it is important to realize that all of the US cases as well as some in England and Australia occur in challenging schools. In these cases, successful capacity building and organizational learning tended to be adaptive of previous literature models (e.g., Marks and Louis 1999) in that principals first had to ensure the physical safety of their students and teachers, as well as get participants to believe there would be leadership stability before school improvement could actually begin to occur. Time, organizational conditions, and sometimes lack of district or regional support placed constraints on collaborative capacity building and organizational learning in these challenging schools. The issues facing these schools were extremely complex, and sometimes the principals had to ignore less immediate issues in order to deal with pressing problems related to school safety and student behavior. In other words, after conducting a careful analysis of their school's context and culture, the principals recognized that it was oftentimes necessary to address urgent local concerns before tackling state or national reform initiatives if they were to have any chance of success.

The Ylimaki et al. chapter expanded on the role of increased accountability and public visibility as two of the most pressing concerns principals confront, using examples from the United States, Australia, and Denmark. Schools in all three of these countries are under the influence of strong international, neo-liberal discourses that have linked education to economic prosperity, neo-conservative trends such as back-to-basics, subject-oriented teaching, and testing programs along with team approaches to teaching and democratic curriculum decision-making processes. Many of the featured principals struggled with how to balance accountability policies and pressures for standardized curricula and still maintain their strong commitments to democratic education and progressive pedagogy. In particular, the principals' struggles and tensions revolved around creating and sustaining democratic ideals, maintaining authentic pedagogy and curriculum, and fostering democratic participation when current policies appeared to encourage quick fixes and standardization.

Ylimaki et al. noted that while Danish, United States, and Australian policies did not fully support democratic purposes of schooling, the principals worked within

their respective accountability contexts and devoted attention to the use of authentic pedagogy and communication. A standout feature of the principals was that they were all good at not only working within their school contexts, but also using these contexts to foster the development of democratic learning communities.

Johnson et al., in Chap. 5, further examined national and local contextual differences in terms of population trends and demographics that affect policies and leadership practices. They noted that while Norway and Cyprus have more homogenous populations than the United States, increased immigration has contributed to growing diversity in all three countries. Norway has a national policy that addresses cultural and language diversity, but the United States must rely on 1980s state and local diversity policies that are still in effect, but not as actively utilized today. Johnson et al. explored these national and local diversity policies and noted several contradictions within and across Norway and Cyprus policy documents, particularly in terms of an "us-them" dichotomous language that assumes a primarily homogenous national culture, one in which immigrant students and families are expected to "fit in." At the same time, they found clear indications that successful principals empowered and responded to the needs of their culturally diverse populations. Johnson et al. concluded that principals' success must be evaluated in light of their abilities to respond to the needs and perspectives of diverse students and their families. Thus, while Leithwood et al. documented converging educational policy trends at the transnational level, school contexts remain malleable at the local level and successful principals and head teachers utilize these differences to influence organizational learning, instructional improvements, and culturally responsive practices to the benefit of their students and schools.

Contextual factors also played a prominent role in leadership preparation. In the United States, professional education and certification requirements are decentralized and determined at the state level; however, all states have an extensive history of pre-service programs delivered by universities. In recent years, there has been a growing use of certification tests and national leadership standards in United States university preparation programs. By contrast, the establishment of the National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services by the Government in England has marginalized the university role in leadership training and professional development. Leadership training in England primarily takes place in regional centers with goals closely aligned with other national "performativity" and results-driven policies. Sweden, Norway, and Denmark's leadership preparation programs also feature strong ties to national goals with more emphasis on democratic education and pedagogical leadership. In other words, these countries are beginning to experience the pressures for accountability firmly established in the United States and England.

Although Australia has also experienced increasing accountability pressures, leadership preparation still occurs primarily through an apprenticeship model. And, as Johnson et al. points out in Chap. 8, personal motivation, life experience, and work experience all shape the growth in effective leadership in schools. Successful leaders develop and hone their skills over time, in part, by adapting to and using the contextual conditions of their schools and communities.

9.1.2 The Layered, Multidimensional, and Socially Constructed Nature of Successful School Leadership

The authors of all three foundational chapters suggest that leadership contributions to school success may be better characterized as a layered, multidimensional process rather than a linear one. According to Day et al., for instance, organizational learning occurs through continuous teacher development in different phases of their professional learning lives and in relation to changing organizational needs. Day et al. found that principals and head teachers in the United States, England, and Sweden perceived leadership influence to be exercised in a distributed and layered manner. In England, for example, one exemplary principal, Jan, fostered and sustained school improvement in overlapping phases all aimed at organizational learning.

This view of layered, multidimensional leadership is congruent with Ylimaki et al.'s finding that instructional leaders give multi-focal attention to academic improvement, accountability policies, and democratic education. Successful principals and head teachers maintain their commitments to the democratic purposes of education and social equity, and yet help teachers focus attention on improvement of academic outcomes. The principal cases discussed in the Ylimaki et al. chapter simultaneously supported teacher empowerment with regards to curricular and instructional decision-making and responsibility for current policy mandates. Leadership in the Danish Commuting School, for instance, is now done at a distance through setting the agenda at plenary meetings and through collaboration with teacher teams. The leaders (the principal and deputy) of the Commuting School are still very clear in stating their position on the values and the direction the school should develop according to democratic ideals. They had developed a number of forms of self-governance and social technologies, which on the one hand provided opportunities for teacher participation and, on the other hand, demanded a high level of personal commitment. In sum, the successful principal cases clearly reflected a continuum of progress toward organizational learning and instructional leadership capacity occurring in layers and stages, particularly in the United States, England, and Australia.

Social equity in culturally diverse schools and communities, as described in the Johnson et al. chapter, is strengthened and enhanced when a principal or head teacher approaches his/her practice as a life experience occurring in multiple directions. In other words, successful school leadership is socially constructed from a dynamic interaction of life experiences and leadership theories into practice. Johnson et al. further remind us that cross-national comparisons illustrate how theories in educational leadership are socially constructed and contextually bound. Successful leaders simultaneously account for social relationships, as well as accountability pressures, across all seven countries; however, accountability is not as intense in Scandinavia and Cyprus, or even Australia, as it is in England and United States. In sum, all three of the foundational chapters offer convincing evidence that successful school leadership is layered, multidimensional, and socially constructed.

9.1.3 The Role of Values and Emotional Engagement in Leadership Influence and Success over Time

Whereas the extant school leadership literature has extensive writing about values and internal qualities or traits, there has been little explicit research that focuses upon the relationships among values, emotions, and capacity building, instructional leadership, and/or culturally responsive practices. How well schools function as communities of values and the extent to which school members are able to achieve a collective sense of purpose appears to influence the extent to which schools are able to achieve their organizational, instructional, and social purposes. Trust and passion, two sets of personal values and emotions that affect school leaders' priorities and practices, are illuminated in the Day et al. chapter as having important relationships with capacity building and organizational learning in schools. Here emotional engagement is at the heart of effective personal and organizational learning. For example, Day et al. found that a principal's support for the development of a professional learning community with shared norms, values, and passionate commitments for learning had a powerful influence on teachers and subsequently on their school's success. In these cases, school communities rely for their well-being upon the emotional as well as intellectual quality of interaction between members that ultimately enabled continued growth in curriculum knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the achievement of their members.

Ylimaki et al. reminded us that broader cultural and political shifts also influence school leaders' values and ways of thinking about curriculum knowledge, pedagogical skills, and learning. That is, circulating discourses about the need for back-to basics instruction and standardized testing influenced principals and other school members' emotions, values, and ways of thinking about curriculum and pedagogy. Similarly, Johnson et al. found that principals and head teachers' personal life experiences affected their commitments to democratic education and culturally responsive leadership practices.

Johnson et al. also found that principals' democratic orientations toward social justice inspired teachers' commitment to inclusive practices. In other words, when teachers and parents recognized their principal's passionate commitment toward social equity and democratic education, they were inspired to create culturally responsive curricula and practices. It was the principal's expressed passion and internal commitment that helped school and community members look beyond a singular focus on academics and work toward a broader appreciation of social equity. It is clear from Johnson et al.'s analysis that a principal's personal life experiences and an abiding commitment to democratic education and social equity influenced the extent to which culturally responsive practices are cultivated and sustained in a global accountability environment. In sum, school leaders' values and emotions turned out to be powerful explanations for how and why principals and head teachers support organizational learning, authentic pedagogy, democratic ideals, and culturally responsive instructional improvements in classrooms.

9.1.4 Implications for Leadership Preparation

In Chaps. 6–8, the authors further examined where and how the principals from their research cases learned and honed the skills they utilized to successfully lead their respective schools. While there were differences according to the national and state/regional context for leadership preparation in each country, there were also key commonalities with implications for improving leadership preparation worldwide. Scholars in all seven countries documented a strong increase in interest in improving school leadership preparation; however, there were clear differences in the primary national objectives of preparation with the United States, Australia, and England focused primarily on learning outcomes, while the Scandinavian countries and Cyprus focused more on citizenship and democratic education. Jacobson et al. described a continuum of preparation services across the United States, England, and Sweden, with long-standing reliance on pre-service preparation in the United States, while pre-service formal preparation is a newer phenomenon in England and Sweden. At the same time, policies in all three nations support the development of successful principals or head teachers with the knowledge and skills to be productive, responsive, and inclusive when working with teachers, students, parents, and community members. Moreover, Jacobson et al. highlight findings by of Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) that the quality of leadership preparation ultimately depends upon the quality of teacher leaders recruited by and then selected into such programs.

Going further, Gurr et al. provided several examples of informal preparation among principals who developed into successful instructional leaders by drawing upon their experiences as excellent teachers. In spite of the differences in the apprenticeship tradition found in Australia and pre-service leadership models found in the United States and Denmark, all of the principals studied in these three countries spoke of the importance of having had experience with a strong and supportive mentor, personal motivation, and a love of learning. The Hamilton case from the United States was particularly salient in this regard in that the principal had a strong mentor in the principal from Fraser, the most exemplary of the successful leadership cases from the United States. More specifically, before becoming the principal at Hamilton, she recalled having experienced Fraser's "turn-around" years while serving as a school counselor in that building. She watched the Fraser principal restore order, foster a safe learning environment, beautify the school, engage parents, develop teachers with strong literacy acquisition philosophies, and develop strong business and community partnerships. In so doing, she developed a clear mental model of how a "successful" principal could turn around a challenging school and then she worked to apply those same strategies when she assumed her leadership role at Hamilton school, which was her first posting as a principal. Likewise, the Colman and Fraser principals in the US cases also learned from their mentors and from on-the-job experience gained from their prior years as principals in other challenging schools.

Case studies from all seven countries further illuminated the importance of hands-on experience for the acquisition and development of successful leadership.

Although goals and outcomes may have varied from context to context, the successful principals described in this volume all used a "hands-on" approach, particularly in relation to the pedagogical changes they wanted to implement. The career path of Tom, one of the Danish principals studied, perhaps best exemplified this type of active, hands-on learner, as Tom was someone who worked in classrooms and participated in teacher teams that engaged in pedagogical and professional dialogue. Several of the leadership programs described in sections about the United States, England, and Sweden used problem- and field-based learning approaches designed explicitly to place aspiring principals or head teachers at the center of organizational learning activities and thus provide them with opportunities to engage in the type of real-world problems that they will potentially face in their schools.

Principals from all seven countries studied also talked about the importance of social and professional support, while our authors described the use of cohort models and other vehicles to help aspiring and current school leaders develop group facilitation and work skills. Across all three chapters on leadership preparation, authors linked cohort preparation models and authentic school-based learning activities to the ability of principals and head teachers to articulate and field test their beliefs and understandings of leadership theories. As Gurr, Drysdale, Ylimaki, and Moos describe in Chap. 7, successful instructional leadership is developed through teamwork and strong relations cultivated through professional learning and experience. Therefore, focused pre- and in-service experiences of this type can only help to build the repertoire of instructional leadership skills of school leaders going forward. Moreover, the successful principals studied in Australia, Denmark, and the United States typically engaged in networks of regional and state committees, offering their expertise and experience with curriculum development, accountability, and diversity issues to colleagues in the field. In other words, the desire to work with teams of productive educators on issues of importance for the benefit of improving student performance became a habit of practice in leadership preparation and then continued throughout their careers. These networks and interactions provided social and emotional support as well as a sense of professional self- and collective efficacy, and as such, should be an integral part of leadership preparation.

In Chap. 8, Johnson, Moller, and Pashiardis noted that diversity issues are often not adequately addressed or even targeted as distinct areas of leadership development in Norway, Cyprus, and the United States. While the United States has a longer tradition of formal leadership preparation than Norway and Cyprus, trends indicate a growing interest in leadership for social justice and cultural diversity in all three countries. Johnson et al., therefore, urge educational leadership faculty to develop leadership preparation programs that provide aspiring principals learning experiences that emphasize critical dialogue and reflection about diversity issues, as well as meaningful internships that include opportunities for interaction with culturally diverse parents and families. Going forward, a leadership preparation focus on diversity appears to be vital as it is critically important for future school leaders to be attentive and responsive to changes in the demographics of their respective schools' communities and to view successful culturally sensitive leadership as complementary to, and not at odds with, successful instructional leadership.

9.2 Final Thoughts and Future Research Plans

Throughout this volume, our contributing authors have documented challenges they faced in their attempts to compare the practices of successful school leaders across nations having different cultures, different histories and different, albeit converging, educational policy contexts. The array of national and local contextual conditions that come together in any one school setting require school leaders to be adaptive and responsive. We found that as successful principals and head teachers adapted and responded to these contextual pressures, they typically distributed leadership in ways that cultivated organizational learning, improved academic performance, and supported culturally responsive practices.

Much of what we have uncovered in the three foundational chapters is supportive of the extant literature on effective school leadership practices (see e.g., Jacobson and Bezzina 2008; Leithwood and Riehl 2005; and/or Mulford et al. 2004), and even of earlier work reported in the single nation cases and compilations from the ISSPP (see e.g., Johansson and Moos, 2009; Leithwood and Day 2007). Where we feel that this work is distinguished from those prior studies and publications and makes a further contribution to the literature on school leadership is in our efforts to examine three significant issues from the perspective of three different nations simultaneously. By allowing scholars to reflect upon their own findings in light of those from other countries, the resulting conversations among authors from diverse contexts adds to our understanding of the similarities and differences in how school leaders practice successfully across sites. Moreover, by asking these same authors to consider the implications of their cross-national findings for the improvement of pre- and in-service leadership preparation gives the resulting conversation an applied, future-oriented perspective. Our aim with this work is to sustain and improve the quality of school leadership and school performance, and potentially increase the available pool of high-caliber principals and head teachers with the ability to successfully lead schools in the future.

The future research agenda for the ISSPP includes an expansion of research sites into more countries, with more schools of varying size, racial and ethnic background, and different cultural locales. The seven nations examined in this volume are all relatively affluent economically, therefore expanding the study into less-affluent nations is essential and has already begun with new research teams in countries such as Mexico, South Africa, and Turkey, to name a few.

ISSPP research teams also plan to include an on-going longitudinal component in order to better understand and inform policymakers with regards to how school improvement and leadership evolves in varying contexts over time. Finally, the ISSPP research teams plan to further consider how emotions, values, and personal life experiences affect successful school leadership. Longitudinal research of successful leaders in educational organizations may be able to surmount the challenges of cross-national comparisons and begin to address remaining questions about how leadership practices evolve and sustain in various school contexts over time.

In his review of the initial collection of ISSPP national reports that appeared in a 2005 special issue of the *Journal of Educational Administration*, Leithwood (2005) noted that the scope and quantitative breadth of the ISSPP case study research has gone some way in overcoming a weakness typical of qualitative research, i.e., findings from such cases being primarily descriptive and informative, and therefore limiting their transference to other contexts. He concluded by applauding the project for making, "progress on a broken front."

We feel that now, 5 years further on in our work, the ISSPP has made even more progress on what has become an even broader front, albeit with some breaks remaining. The national and transnational cases developed by the project continue to add to the literature on successful school leadership by further identifying the isomorphic and idiosyncratic characteristics of leadership across diverse contexts, especially as they relate to organizational learning and capacity building, instructional leadership, and culturally responsive practices, and then by considering how these new understandings can be used to inform and improve pre- and in-service leadership preparation.

References

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr. M., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs*. Palo Alto: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

Jacobson, S., & Bezzina, C. (2008). The effects of leadership on student academic/affective achievement. In G. Crow, J. Lumby, & P. Pashiardis (Eds.), *The international handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders* (pp. 80–102). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Johansson, O., & Moos, L. (2009). Guest editors. Sustaining successful school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration, 47*(6), 765–780.

Leithwood, K. (2005). Understanding successful principal leadership: Progress on a broken front. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 619–629.

Leithwood, K., & Day, C. (2007). *Successful principal leadership in times of change: An international perspective* Dordrecht: Springer.

Leithwood, K., & Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership efficacy effects on student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 529–561.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2005). What we know about successful school leadership. In W. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda: Directions for research on educational leadership*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Marks, H. & Louis, K. (1999). Teacher empowerment and the capacity for organizational learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(Suppl.), 707–750.

Mulford, W., Silins, H., & Leithwood, K. (2004). *Educational leadership for organisational learning and improved student outcomes*. Boston: Kluwer.

Author Index

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

Subject Index

R. M. Ylimaki, S. L. Jacobson (eds.), *US and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation,* Studies in Educational Leadership 12,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0542-5, © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011